LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
00010352393

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

FEDERAL EDITION

Limited to 1000 signed and numbered sets.

The Collector's Edition of the Writings of Henry Clay is limited to six hundred signed and numbered sets, of which this is

Number 461

We guarantee that no limited, numbered edition, other than the Federal, shall be printed from these plates.

The written number must correspond with the perforated number at the top of this page.

G. P. Putnam's Sons

H. Clay

The

Works of

Henry Clay

in

Ten Volumes

Federal Edition

The Works of

Henry Clay

Comprising His Life, Correspondence and Speeches

Edited by

Calvin Colton, LL.D.

With an Introduction by

Thomas B. Reed

And a History of Tariff Legislation, 1812–1896

by

William McKinley

Ten Volumes

G. P. Putnam's Sons
New York and London
The Knickerbocker Press
1904

E337
.8
.C562

The Works of Henry Clay

Volume Three

Life and Times

Part Three

Correspondence between Henry Clay
and Thomas B. Stevenson

PREFATORY NOTE

The author has traveled over the record of the great debate on the Compromise measures of 1850, and selected from the *Congressional Globe* such passages as he thought would rightly and fully represent Mr. Clay on the important subjects which he handled in the Senate in that year. These numerous extracts will be found in the Appendix, together with a variety of other matter of very great interest. As is not usual, the Appendix to this volume will, probably, be found equally as interesting and instructive as the main body of the work.

The contribution from Thomas B. Stevenson, Esq., in the last fifty pages of this volume, forms a most interesting chapter of history. It will not be thought strange that Mr. Clay's lofty, frank, generous, and confiding mind should have been wounded at the treatment he received at the hands of the Philadelphia Whig Convention in 1848, when he was placed in a false position there, by a majority of the delegation from his own State, and by the delegation from Ohio *en masse* with the exception of a single individual. If Mr. Clay could have foreseen that these delegations would violate the wishes of their constituents, he would never have consented that his name should go before the Convention. As Mr. Stevenson intimates, there is an unwritten story

of Kentucky, like that which is here given of Ohio; for which, if we might judge from Mr. Clay's letter to the Louisville Committee (see Volume IV., page 566), there is some interesting material. Mr. Clay had the best reasons of common good faith for relying on the States of Kentucky and Ohio in Convention. It was a point of honor and of political integrity; and a man who had deserved so well of his country, because he had served it so well, should not have been placed in such a position by bad faith. It was a point on which Mr. Clay had a just right to be sensitive.

CALVIN COLTON

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

A Retrospect. Resumption of this work after ten years.—Interview between Mr. Clay and Presidential Electors.—Judge Underwood's Address.—Mr. Clay's Reply.—A Touching Scene.—Author's Visit to Ashland.—Mr. Clay's Character.—The Raleigh Letter.—Annexation of Texas.—Mr. Clay's Predictions about Annexation.—Mr. Tyler's and Mr. Polk's hand in the Annexation of Texas.—Verification of Mr. Clay's Predictions. 13

CHAPTER II.

Occupation of the Winter of 1844–'45.—General Jackson and his Party.—Not a Party of Principle.—The Whig Party.—Payment of Mr. Clay's Debts by his Friends.—Silver Vase Presented by the Gold and Silver Artisans of New York.—Statue of Mr. Clay ordered by Ladies of Richmond.—Silver Vase by Ladies of Tennessee.—Mr. Clay's Speech on receiving it.—Mr. Clay at New Orleans and St. Louis.—His speech at New Orleans for the famishing Irish.—Letter of thanks from two Irishmen.—Death of Colonel Henry Clay, and General Taylor's Letter to Mr. Clay announcing the sad event.—Mr. Clay's Baptism and first Communion.—Letter from Rev. Mr. Berkley, Mr. Clay's Pastor, on his Christian Character.—Anecdote to same point.—Mr. Clay's visit to Cape May, and Interview with a Committee from New York, and Others.—Speeches.—Return to Ashland. 37

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Clay's feelings on the Mexican War.—His Speech at Lexington, and Resolutions on the War.—A Defect of the Federal Constitution.—Popular Action in response to Mr. Clay's Speech.—Mr. Clay at Washington.—His Speech before the Colonization Society.—Mr. Clay in the Supreme Court.—Death of Mr. Adams.—Mr. Clay's Reception at Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York. 58

CHAPTER IV.

PAGE

THE FALL OF THE WHIG PARTY. History of the Apostasy of the Whig Party from Whig Principles.—The Injustice to Mr. Clay in the Nomination of General Harrison and of General Taylor.—Mr. Clay a sacrificial victim.—The Overthrow of the Whig Party.—Mr. Clay's spotless Reputation and Fame. 88

CHAPTER V.

Mr. Clay again in the Senate of the United States.—What the Senate may do while waiting for the Organization of the House.—Are you Married or Single?—Mr. Clay's Plea to admit Father Mathew on the floor.—A tie Vote for Chaplain.—Pleasantry and Sarcasm of Mr. Clay.—Mr. Clay on Mr. Cass's Resolution to suspend Diplomatic Intercourse with Austria.—Mr. Clay on the Purchase of the Manuscript Copy of Washington's Farewell Address.—On the Purchase of Mount Vernon. 100

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850. The critical Condition of the Country.—Mr. Clay's Resolutions of Compromise, and his Opening Remarks upon them.—The Boundary of Texas on the West and North-West, as Claimed by Herself.—The Consequences of the false Pretext of Congress for the Mexican War.—Origin of the Wilmot Proviso.— General Taylor opposed to the Claims of Texas, and Danger of a Civil War.—Mr. Rusk and other Senators oppose Mr. Clay's Resolutions. 112

CHAPTER VII.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850. Review of Mr. Clay's great Speech on his Compromise Resolutions.—Mr. Clay's Project for the gradual Abolition of Slavery in the State of Kentucky.—Extract from Mr. Clay's Will. 129

CHAPTER VIII.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850. The Plan of Mr. Clay.—What is a Compromise?—Ultraists opposed to Mr. Clay.—Abuse by Abolitionists.—Slavery abolished in Mexico.—Mr. Bell's Resolutions.—Mr. Foote's Motion for a Committee of Thirteen.—An extraordinary Scene in the Senate.—Report of the Committee of Thirteen.—Its Reception.—Opposition of the President.—Mr. Clay's Remarks on this Opposition.—Mr. Bell defends the President.—Death of the President.—Mr. Clay's Disinterestedness.—Mr. Webster on the Wilmot Proviso.—Mr. Clay's Opinion on carrying Slavery into the Territories.—Consequences of the Defeat or Success of the Bill.—Treason in South Carolina.—Defeat of the Bill a Victory. 155

CHAPTER IX.

PAGE

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850. Mr. Clay the Chieftain.—The Defeat a Victory.—Mr. Clay's Resolutions all carried out.—Mr. Clay's position in the Compromise toward the North and South.—The *lex loci* of the New Territories.—The Virginia Resolutions of '98.—The Nature of Compromise Legislation.—The obnoxious features of the Fugitive Slave Law.—The Compromises are Covenants. 182

CHAPTER X.

Mr. Clay's Patriotism.—Conspiracy to break down Mr. Clay.—The Secret of his Success.—Mr. Clay would try the Strength of the Government against Nullification.—Federal Authority paramount.—Who Defeated the Bill.—Mr. Clay goes to Newport.—Is Benefited.—Returns to Washington.—Mr. Clay exhausted.—His Desire of Home.—Mr. Clay's Predictions in his Raleigh Letter Fulfilled.—Why he went to the Senate this last time. 195

CHAPTER XI.

Continued agitation.—Declaration and Pledge, headed by Mr. Clay, against the Agitators.—Effect thereof.—Mr. Clay's Proposal to Amend the Tariff of 1846.—Mr. Clay a practical and national man.—"I know no North, no South, no East, no West."—Mr. Clay's efforts for the River and Harbor bill defeated for want of the Previous Question.—His last battle. 204

CHAPTER XII.

Close of Thirty-first Congress.—Mr. Clay rejects "Constructive Mileage."—His Opposition to it.—Mr. Clay's Lungs Injured.—Cough.—Returns to Ashland by way of Cuba.—Correspondence with Judge Beatty.—Health poor.—Mr. Clay apprehends the Secession Question in Congress.—The Gold Medal to Mr. Clay.—Increasing Illness.—His Reception of Kossuth. 214

CHAPTER XIII.

Mr. Clay's Decline.—Extracts from his own Letters and from those of his Son on the subject.—His Death.—Eulogies of Senators. 225

CHAPTER XIV.

Résumé of the Life and Character of Henry Clay. 263

APPENDIX.

Note A.

PAGE
Mr. Clay's Great Speech on his Compromise Resolutions. 302

Note B.

Mr. Clay's Letter to Richard Pindell on Gradual Emancipation in the State of Kentucky. 346

Note C.

Mr. Clay's Allusion in Debate to his Letter on Emancipation. 353

Note D.

Fifty-eight Extracts from Mr. Clay's Speeches in the great Debate on the Compromise, beginning January 29 and ending August 1, 1850—with a variety of incidents. . . . . 354—396
Mr. Benton on the Fugitive Slave Law. 396
A Letter from Mr. Clay to his Fellow-Citizens in New York, October 3, 1851, on the state of the country. 402

Note E.

Eulogies in the House of Representatives on Mr. Clay, pronounced the day after his death. 413

Note F.

The Obsequies of Mr. Clay —Funeral Cortège from Washington to Lexington.—Honors to the illustrious deceased on the way, and the universal manifestations of sorrow.—The Funeral Solemnities at Lexington. . . . 438

Note G.

A Letter from Mr. Clay on Dueling. 451

Note H.

Extracts from Mr. Clay's Speech in the Senate on the Death of Mr. Calhoun. . 453

CORRESPONDENCE,

1843 to 1851.

Edited by Thomas B. Stevenson, Esq.—Disclosing a new Chapter of History, with twenty-nine Letters from Mr. Clay, never before published. . . . 455

Index. 501

THE

LAST SEVEN YEARS

OF THE

LIFE OF HENRY CLAY.

CHAPTER I.

A RETROSPECT.

Resumption of this work after ten years.—Interview between Mr. Clay and Presidential Electors.—Judge Underwood's Address.—Mr. Clay's Reply.—A Touching Scene.—Author's Visit to Ashland.—Mr. Clay's Character.—The Raleigh Letter.—Annexation of Texas.—Mr. Clay's Predictions about Annexation.—Mr. Tyler's and Mr. Polk's hand in the Annexation of Texas.—Verification of Mr. Clay's Predictions.

TEN years have rolled away since the author wrote the first two volumes of this work. At that time the subject of these pages had retired to the shades of Ashland, somewhat wearied with the cares of public life, but erect as ever in the manly vigor of his character, with a pulse still beating warmly in his heart for the country he had so long served, and which had so recently refused him the chair of its Chief Magistrate by electing his opponent. The author saw him much, and had frequent and intimate intercourse with him, in the winter of 1844–45, when the contest which gave him the relief of retirement was over, and when the regrets of his friends, scattered over the country and over the world, were pouring in upon him, to express their disappointment at the result of the presidential election of 1844, and to renew their unabated, undying devotion to a statesman and leader so much beloved and so long confided in. The sympathy for defeat was, in this case, a prouder legacy than a coronal of victory. Millions of hearts still did homage to the patriot-sage, and he was more exalted as the object of such affection than he ever could have been as the chief execu-

tive of the nation. It was not the compliment of empty adulation for benefits in his gift, but a sincere tribute of gratitude for benefits which his public services had conferred on the country; and beyond this, it was personal affection for the man. For Mr. Clay had the art, or rather without art, he was endowed with a nature, to make personal friends even of those he never saw. He was beloved more extensively than almost any man that ever lived. He had a heart, always frank, always open, always quick to all the sympathies of the social state, which never failed to touch the hearts of others, and which sent out its vigorous and warm pulsations wherever his words and thoughts were reported. He had the rare faculty of telling the thoughts of others, and revealing the secrets of their own bosoms; and that is the man that the world admires and loves; and he was honest withal, sincere. Truth was his idol, and fairness his religion, till he was baptized in the grace of God; and even then he did not have to change his religion so far as this feeling is concerned, or show less respect for truthfulness. These qualities of the man only had a higher motive and a purer aim. Before, he loved truth because he had a natural aversion to its opposite, and because he saw it was right in itself, and useful in society; and he loved it all the more, when he came to recognize its Divine sanction. Mr. Clay was never a skeptic on the subject of religion, and in embracing it, he only received into his heart that which he was prepared to entertain by the uniform convictions of his life.

As the second volume of this work only brought down the life of Mr. Clay to the close of the presidential campaign of 1844, we find a very befitting link with the future from that period, in the touching interview between Mr. Clay and the Presidential Electors of Kentucky, which occurred early in December of that year, at Ashland. The members of the Electoral College of Kentucky, having discharged their duty at Frankfort, in casting their vote for Mr. Clay as President, repaired, in company of the Governor of the State, to Lexington, to express to Mr. Clay their abiding affection and confidence. It was an unceremonious call, and Mr. Clay had only a few hours previous notice. The author of these pages had arrived in Lexington, to spend the winter there, in connection with Mr. Clay, to collect materials for the preceding volumes. He had

had no notice of this appointment till he observed an artillery company on parade, in the morning, after breakfast, in front of his hotel. Of course, hearing the occasion, he could but fall in with the procession, and proceed to Ashland, a mile distant, to witness this interesting interview. The artillery marched up the long avenue, formed by an admirable turnpike road, with music at their head, and turning into the gate at Ashland, formed in front of Mr. Clay's mansion, where the members of the Electoral College and citizens of Lexington, with a few strangers, also assembled. It was a purely extemporaneous occasion, and one of singular, even exciting interest. It was an occasion, too, of profound solemnity. It was not to celebrate a victory, but to honor a defeat. It was to say to the MAN—the fame of whose long public life had sounded out through all lands, and who had so recently been rejected by the nation which he had so long served with a rare fidelity—SIR, WE LOVE YOU; STILL WE LOVE YOU; WE REVERE YOU. It was a small band of patriots assembled there, to honor the great AMERICAN PATRIOT. There had been no call made on the people, else the wide-spread lawns of Ashland could not have contained them. The cars had arrived that morning from Frankfort, with the Electors, who stepped from the cars into carriages, to be driven to Ashland. The movement from Lexington was instantaneous and voluntary—unmarshaled. Even the small military parade of a company of artillery was an impromptu assemblage. But the heart that was in it was to be measured inversely as the pageant. Of the latter there was little; while the former could be told only by the inspirations of a poet.

This singular assemblage stood mute in front of the mansion so long known as Ashland, waiting for something—for what? Their instincts resolved the question, though no bulletin had announced the purpose. It was rumored that the Electors had come from Frankfort to see Mr. Clay, and it was known they could not part without some words. The author made one of this assemblage, as he saw the tall and dignified form of Mr. Clay emerge from the hall, and take his station on the step of his house, uncovered, and bowing, as all who have seen him bow know how he was wont to do it, to command the most fixed attention of all before him. Every head was uncovered the moment he appeared before them. But, there was no acclaim—not a word—not a breath. The scene and occasion

were so perfectly novel, that each one was embarrassed to know how to receive the venerable patriot, and all was hushed to the profoundest stillness. The thoughts and feelings of all were more funereal than joyous; for the occasion grew out of a great disappointment—of a national sorrow.

Judge Underwood, as the organ of the Electoral College, stepped forward, bowing, and addressed Mr. Clay, as follows:

"Mr. Clay: I have been selected by the members of our Electoral College to say to you, for each one of us, that we have come to offer you the homage of our personal regard and profound respect. In this work of the heart, many of your neighbors have likewise come to unite with us. On yesterday, at Frankfort, we performed our official duty in obedience to the will of the people of Kentucky, by voting unanimously for yourself and Theodore Frelinghuysen, to fill the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States.

"The machinations of your enemies, their frauds upon the elective franchise, and their duplicity with the people, in promulgating opposite principles in different sections, have defeated your election.

"We have no hope of preferment at your hands, which can tempt us to flatter, nor can the ban of proscription intimidate us in speaking the truth. Under existing circumstances it gratifies us to take you by the hand, and to unite, as we do most cordially, in expressing the sentiments of our hearts and of those we represent, in regard to your personal character and political principles.

"Your past services are so interwoven with the history of our country for the last forty years, that malice and envy can not prevent succeeding generations from dwelling on your name with admiration and gratitude. Your example will illuminate the path of future statesmen, when those who hate and revile you are forgotten, or are only remembered, like the incendiary who burned the temple, for the evil they have done.

"To you the election has terminated without personal loss; but to the nation, in our judgment, the injury is incalculable. God grant that the confederacy may not hereafter mourn over the result in dismembered fragments!

"While your enemies have not attempted to detract from your intellectual character, they have, with untiring malice, attacked your moral reputation, and endeavored to destroy it. The verbal slanders and printed libels employed as means to accomplish political objects, have stained the character of our country and its institutions more than they have injured yours.

"In your high personal character, in your political principles,

and unrivaled zeal and ability to carry them out, may be found the strong motives for our anxious efforts to secure your election. The protection of American labor, a national currency connected with a fiscal agent for the government, the distribution among the States of the proceeds of the public lands, further constitutional restrictions upon executive power and patronage, and a limitation upon the eligibility of the president for a second term, were measures which, under your administration, we hoped to mature and bring into practical operation. By your defeat they have been endangered, if not forever lost.

"But we will not speculate on coming events. If things work well, we shall find consolation in the general prosperity. If apprehended evils come, we are not responsible; and, retaining our principles, we shall enjoy the happy reflection of having done our duty.

"In the shades of Ashland may you long continue to enjoy peace, quiet, and the possession of those great faculties which have rendered you the admiration of your friends and the benefactor of your country. And when at last death shall demand its victim, while Kentucky will contain your ashes, rest assured that old and faithful friends—those who, knowing you longest, loved you best—will cherish your memory and defend your reputation."

The author watched the countenance of Mr. Clay during the progress of this address, but he knows not how to describe it. There was evidently some nervous excitement and occasional writhings of the muscles of his face. How natural was that in presence of such an assemblage, on such an occasion! He knew they were all his friends, all disappointed, all sorrowful; and he sympathized with their sorrow. We do not think it was for himself that he was so profoundly moved, but for those before him—for his country. He could but know that millions of hearts had been, and still were throbbing with like sentiments of grief; and, could a man of so much heart as he was ever known to have, fail to be moved at such a spectacle there presented, when this could only remind him of the vastly ramified pulse of the nation beating in the same manner? He was evidently greatly moved; and it was with extreme difficulty that he, who could brave a world in arms against him, could, in such presence, and with such thoughts, reply to Judge Underwood, occasionally choked in his utterance, as follows:

"I am greatly obliged, gentlemen, by the kindness toward me, which has prompted this visit from the Governor, the Presidential

Electors of Kentucky, and some of my fellow-citizens in private life. And I thank you sir (Mr. Underwood), their organ on this occasion, for the feeling and eloquent address which you have just done me the honor to deliver. I am under the greatest obligations to the people of Kentucky. During more than forty years of my life they have demonstrated their confidence and affection toward me in every variety of form. This last and crowning evidence of their long and faithful attachment, exhibited in the vote which, in their behalf, you gave yesterday at the seat of the State Government, as the Electoral College of Kentucky, fills me with overflowing gratitude. But I should fail to express the feelings of my heart, if I did not also offer my profound and grateful acknowledgments to the other States which have united with Kentucky in the endeavor to elect n. to the chief magistracy of the Union, and to the million and a quarter of freemen, embracing so much virtue, intelligence, and patriotism, who, wherever residing, have directed strenuous and enthusiastic exertions to the same object.

"Their effort has been unavailing, and the issue of the election has not corresponded with their anxious hopes and confident expectations. You have, sir, assigned some of the causes which you suppose have occasioned the result. I will not trust myself to speak of them. My duty is that of perfect submission to an event which is now irrevocable.

"I will not affect indifference to the personal concern I had in the political contest just terminated: but, unless I am greatly self-deceived, the principal attraction to me of the office of President of the United States arose out of the cherished hope that I might be an humble instrument in the hands of Providence to accomplish public good. I desired to see the former purity of the general government restored, and to see dangers and evils which I sincerely believed encompassed it, averted and remedied. I was anxious that the policy of the country, especially in the great department of domestic labor and industry, should be fixed and stable, and that all might know how to regulate and accommodate their conduct. And, fully convinced of the wisdom of the public measures, which you have enumerated, I hoped to live to witness, and to contribute to, their adoption and establishment.

"So far as respects any official agency of mine, it has been otherwise decreed, and I bow respectfully to the decree. The future course of the government is altogether unknown, and wrapped in painful uncertainty. I shall not do the new administration the injustice of condemning it in advance. On the contrary, I earnestly desire that, enlightened by its own reflections, and by a deliberate review of all the great interests of the coun

and prompted by public opinion, the benefit may yet .

secured of the practical execution of those principles and measures for which we have honestly contended; that peace and honor may be preserved; and that this young but great nation may be rendered harmonious, prosperous, and powerful.

"We are not without consolations under the event which has happened. The Whig party has fully and fairly exhibited to the country the principles and measures which it believed best adapted to secure our liberties and promote the common welfare. It has made, in their support, constant and urgent appeals to the reason and judgment of the people. For myself, I have the satisfaction to know that I have escaped a great and fearful responsibility; and that, during the whole canvass, I have done nothing inconsistent with the dictates of the purest honor. No mortal man is authorized to say that I held out to him the promise of any office or appointment whatever.

"What now is the duty of the Whig party? I venture to express an opinion with the greatest diffidence. The future is enveloped in a vail impenetrable by human eyes. I can not contemplate it without feelings of great discouragement. But I know of only one safe rule in all the vicissitudes of human life, public and private, and that is, conscientiously to satisfy ourselves of what is right, and firmly and undeviatingly to pursue it, under all trials and circumstances, confiding in the Great Ruler of the universe for ultimate success. The Whigs are deliberately convinced of the truth and wisdom of the principles and measures which they have espoused. It seems, therefore, to me, that they should persevere in contending for them; and that, adhering to their separate and distinct organization, they should treat all who have got the good of their country in view with respect and sympathy, and invite their co-operation in securing the patriotic objects which it has been their aim and purpose to accomplish.

"I heartily thank you, sir, for your friendly wishes for my happiness, in the retirement which henceforward best becomes me. Here I hope to enjoy peace and tranquillity, seeking faithfully to perform, in the walks of private life, whatever duties may yet appertain to me. And I shall never cease, while life remains, to look, with lively interest and deep solicitude, upon the movement and operations of our free system of government, and to hope that, under the smiles of an all-wise Providence, our Republic may be ever just, honorable, prosperous and great."

But if Mr. Clay was moved, how much more the assemblage of friends before him, when they looked on his form and face, thought of his character and history, remembered his public services, his long-tried fidelity to his friends and to the nation,

his unrivaled and uncompromising advocacy of truth and right, his parliamentary eloquence and achievements, his executive talents, his social qualities, his deferential manner toward all worthy of his respect, his courtesy and unaffected kindness, and saw before them the GREAT REJECTED, and heard him say, in subdued tones and with difficult utterance, in such circumstances, and on such an occasion, "I thank you, gentlemen"—how could they fail to be moved? There was not a man, nor a youth, nor a boy there, that did not weep as the heart pours out its grief on the most painful events of life. Men leaning on a cannon, or with sword in belt, with hearts strong to fight the battles of their country, if need be, stood there with streaming eyes, because of the wrongs done to their chieftain. All knew that he was defeated by fraud, as shown in chapter xviii. vol. ii. They parted, and went to their homes in sorrow. We would rather have failed to witness the pageant of a conquering hero returning from his battles, amid the deafening acclamations of a whole people, the ringing of bells, and the roar of artillery, than to have been absent from the scene at Ashland above described.

The author of these pages spent the winter of 1844–45 at Lexington, in daily communication with Mr. Clay, while in quest of materials for the first two volumes of this work, and had frequent opportunities to witness the proofs of affection rendered to Mr. Clay, not unlike those above described, by the people of Lexington, by pilgrims to Ashland from various parts of the country, some very remote, and by letters, with which every day's mail was burdened, some brief extracts from which are given in chapter xix. vol. ii., and numerous letters in full, of a like character, will be found in chapter xii. vol. iv., which is devoted to Mr. Clay's *Private Correspondence.* It was in view of these marks of affection that Mr. Clay says, in a letter of the 25th of April, 1845:

"I have been, in spite of unexpected discomfitures, the object of honors and of compliments usually rendered only to those who are successful and victorious in the great enterprises of mankind. To say nothing of other demonstrations, the addresses and communications which I have received since the election, from every quarter, from collective bodies and individuals, and from both sexes, conveying sentiments and feelings of the warmest regard and strongest friendship, and deploring the issue

of the election, would fill a volume. I have been quite as much, if not more, affected by them than I was by any disappointment of personal interest of my own in the event of the contest."

Ordinarily, as all the world knows, the political defeat of a public man, is the end of his story, and the end of public regard. He must have some strong marks of character to retain a place in history. But when the instincts of a wide public, of mankind, render involuntary homage to a spirit that has been among them, to a genius that has made an impression upon them, the man that has excited such observation, can not be of an ordinary character. If Washington was adored, Mr. Clay was beloved. Washington gained supremacy over the mind of man as a minister from heaven, sent on a special embassy. He never stooped to be an equal of those around him. He could not stoop. His great mission was in an elevated sphere, and he would have failed if he had descended to a common level. His position was ever high, and forever being lifted up. His fellowmen could not but regard him as a superior being, and therefore he was revered. Washington was sent to achieve the freedom of his country. It was Mr. Clay's mission to vindicate it.

Mr. Clay was all human. His frailties—for none will deny that he had them—were human. But his better instincts were ever in the ascendant. He was a man of genius, and genius always oversteps the ordinary laws of humanity. His human failings always kept him in sympathy with those about him, at the same time that his genius advised him of his own superiority—a superiority the very attributes of which always suppressed and held in check offensive displays of itself. It was a part of his genius to be deferential, respectful, courteous—and such courtesy as man is rarely endowed with—a courtesy that wins its way to every heart, and captivates the affections of those on whom it is bestowed. It was eminently the humanity of Mr. Clay which allured all humanity to himself. All saw and felt that he was a man of like passions and feelings with themselves. There was no distance between Mr. Clay and his friends, but his heart always addressed itself to their hearts, as the face of man reflects itself from the mirror before which he stands. And Mr. Clay was the same in public as in private. That same deference and courtesy which gained the heart of a friend, and having gained it, never lost it, carried the

same insinuating, captivating influence, in a wide sweep over the public mind. If all could not see and hear, each for himself, all could read; and Mr. Clay's words reported, produced the same effect, though less in degree, as his words addressed to the ear. They came from a deep conviction, and carried conviction with them. And besides all this, there is always a contagion of influence in such a man's character which goes before his personal presence, and spreads out like the ripples of the glassy surface of a lake, in which a stone has been cast, till they gently touch the entire surrounding border. The nature of man is like the world of nature around him, every part of which has its relations to other parts. It is the same in the advent of a superior genius. His relations are vast, extending over the entire surface of society, and his influence can not be limited.

The following eloquent tribute to Mr. Clay, by the Hon. Thomas L. Clingman, of North Carolina, in a speech in the House of Representatives, March 7, 1844, seven years before Mr. Clay's death, is pertinent here, as one of the many brief descriptions of his character to be found on record:

"To the fertile genius, vast sagacity, and large patriotism o Themistocles, Henry Clay has added the justice of his riva Aristides, the frankness of Cato, the daring of Cæsar, the eloquence of Tully. He never failed a friend or fled a foe. When the storm was wildest his voice has been heard loudest. When the battle was hottest he has ever stood in the front of the column. His path has led him through many a difficulty and danger. At times he might have complained of ingratitude and obloquy. Once it seemed as if he was destined to go down to his grave with a cloud on his fame.

"But, for all this, he never swerved or hesitated for a moment in his onward course. Ever bearing a high heart under adversity, he has stood erect in the darkest hours of the Republic, and kept alive the spirit of liberty and of resistance to tyranny and oppression. Many of those who stood with him at the outset of his career, fainted by the wayside, or wandered away from their principles. But he has been

> 'Faithful found
> Among the faithless * *
> * * * * * unmoved,
> Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified.
> His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal,
> Nor number nor example with him wrought,
> To swerve from truth, or change his constant mind."

The following graphic sketch of "the personal endowments" of Mr. Clay, from the "Louisville Journal," pending the Presidential campaign of 1844, is worthy of a place here. It is no small praise to the press of our country, that in its common emissions it should present such articles. But, in this case, it was doubtless the theme that inspired the writer:

"Mr. Clay is an honest man; he is a fair-dealing man; he is a true man; he is a man who believes in his own principles, who follows his own convictions, who avows his sentiments, and acts on them; who never deserted a friend; who was never deterred from his purpose; who was never seduced from what he undertook to do. He is a man of faith, in the largest sense of the word. No man has ever been more severely tried in public life, in this country, than Mr. Clay; and no man ever exhibited a more sublime manhood in the character of trustworthiness. * * * Let him be right, or let him be wrong, he will do what he says he will do. * * * He has great force of will, and high moral courage. * * * That lofty self-reliance, that noble strength of character, that intrepid pursuit of what one resolves to accomplish, that power over circumstances and over men, that mental and moral capacity which enables a man to bear away the obstacles which he encounters, that instinct of triumph in all that one resolves to effect—these are traits which Mr. Clay possesses in a very high degree. * * Mr. Clay is generous and wise, as well as firm and full of conviction. Such a man seems as if he had two souls: one all force and power, and the other all gentleness and trust. * * * The most remarkable mental endowment of Mr. Clay *is his common sense.* If we except Benjamin Franklin, he is the most sagacious man this country has ever produced. His knowledge of affairs seems rather intuitive than the result of experience. * * * His fame as an orator is world-wide. But what is the oratory of those great discourses? No flowers of rhetoric adorn them. No vast fund of acquired erudition. Mr. Clay hardly ever quotes from books. No elaborate argumentations. What then? The grandeur of an intellect that seems to perceive truth intuitively, united to a pathos fervent as that of Demosthenes. * * * If we wanted a grammarian, in the ancient sense of the word, we would take Mr Calhoun; if we wanted the clearest demonstration of a given proposition, we would have none but Webster; if we desired the aid of all that is rich, full, and overwhelming in true eloquence, Preston is the man; if we needed the clearest, purest, and most beautiful advocacy of all right and noble things, Crittendon is the living model; but, if we desire to know the truth, to be taught the right, to be kept from delusion, to be set in the way in which we ought to

walk for our country's good, and to be supported in the noble race, then Henry Clay is the true guide; and it is nearly the same whether the lesson be given from the halls of Congress or from the shades of Ashland. Call it as you will, we call it *common sense*, under the guidance of an intellect by the side of which few that have existed could stand as rivals.

"Mr. Clay has been, on all occasions, for nearly half a century, wholly invincible, whenever he has been called to act on any theater where he could hold personal interviews with all the other actors. At the bar, in popular assemblies, in both houses of Congress, who was ever with him habitually that did not feel the power of his bewitching influence, or fall in open combat before his irresistible might? Many of the ablest men of the age have struggled, toe to toe, against him on every theater where he has ever acted. Which one of them all failed to be overmastered? Many of the noblest spirits this country has produced have lived on terms of constant friendly intercourse with him; and which one of them ever exerted over Mr. Clay a thousandth part of the influence that Mr. Clay did over him? Who ever suspected him of being led by other men? No, this is a man to lead, not to be himself guided by other minds."

It might seem partial to borrow two such brief descriptions of Mr. Clay's character as the above, given while he was living, when the press of the country for the last forty years teems with similar pictures, by eminent men, and in eloquent phrase, both of prose and poetry, which, if collected, would swell out numerous volumes. But our object is history, not eulogy. In resuming a task ten years laid by, when the subject of our story is three years in his grave, with a memory which only grows more hallowed as it loses its freshness, we might, perhaps, be pardoned for a brief expression of our admiration of his character. Doubtless we shall oft betray it, in the progress of this volume, as new developments of the same tried character are unfolded, when the mind, the patriotism, the wisdom of the man fail not, though his body fail; where the virtues of the soul rise and shine with greater luster, in proportion as the bodily faculties droop, and give token of approaching dissolution.

It will be somewhat indispensable, as we think, to a right understanding of some of the future parts of this volume, that the reader should have before him, as a subject of reference, what has always been called Mr. Clay's *Raleigh Letter*. We, therefore, give the main body of it, dropping only one, though a considerable paragraph. It is as follows:

"TO THE EDITORS OF THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

"RALEIGH, April 17, 1844.

"GENTLEMEN—Subsequent to my departure from Ashland, in December last, I received various communications from popular assemblages and private individuals, requesting an expression of my opinion upon the question of the annexation of Texas to the United States. I have foreborne to reply to them, because it was not very convenient, during the progress of my journey, to do so, and for other reasons. I did not think it proper unnecessarily to introduce at present a new element among the other exciting subjects which agitate and engross the public mind. The rejection of the overture of Texas, some years ago, to become annexed to the United States, had met with general acquiescence. Nothing had since occurred materially to vary the question. I had seen no evidence of a desire being entertained, on the part of any considerable portion of the American people, that Texas should become an integral part of the United States. During my sojourn in New Orleans, I had, indeed, been greatly surprised, by information which I received from Texas, that, in the course of last fall, a voluntary overture had proceeded from the Executive of the United States, to the authorities of Texas, to conclude a treaty of annexation; and that, in order to overcome the repugnance felt by any of them to a negotiation upon the subject, strong, and as I believed, erroneous representations had been made to them of a state of opinion in the Senate of the United States favorable to the ratification of such a treaty. According to these representations, it had been ascertained that a number of Senators, varying from thirty-five to forty-two, were ready to sanction such a treaty. I was aware, too, that holders of Texas bonds and Texas scrip, and speculators in them, were actively engaged in promoting the object of annexation. Still I did not believe that any Executive of the United States would venture upon so grave and momentous a proceeding not only without any general manifestation of public opinion in favor of it, but in direct opposition to strong and decided expressions of public disapprobation. But it appears that I was mistaken. To the astonishment of the whole nation, we are now informed that a treaty of annexation has been actually concluded, and is to be submitted to the Senate for its consideration.

"The motives for my silence, therefore, no longer remain, and I feel it to be my duty to present an exposition of my views and opinions upon the question, for what they may be worth, to the public consideration. I adopt this method as being more convenient than several replies to the respective communications which I have received.

"I regret that I have not the advantage of a view of the treaty itself, so as to enable me to adapt an expression of my opinion

to the actual conditions and stipulations which it contains. Not possessing that opportunity, I am constrained to treat the question according to what I presume to be the terms of the treaty. If, without the loss of national character, without the hazard of foreign war, with the general concurrence of the nation, without any danger to the integrity of the Union, and without giving an unreasonable price for Texas, the question of annexation were presented, it would appear in quite a different light from that in which, I apprehend, it is now to be regarded.

"The United States acquired a title to Texas, extending, as I believe, to the Rio del Norte, by the treaty of Louisiana. They ceded and relinquished that title to Spain by the treaty of 1819, by which the Sabine was substituted for the Rio del Norte, as our western boundary. This treaty was negotiated under the administration of Mr. Monroe, and with the concurrence of his Cabinet, of which Messrs. Crawford, Calhoun, and Wirt, being a majority, all Southern gentlemen, composed a part. When the treaty was laid before the House of Representatives, being a member of that body, I expressed the opinion, which I then entertained, and still hold, that Texas was sacrificed to the acquisition of Florida. We wanted Florida; but I thought it must, from its position, inevitably fall into our possession; that the point of a few years, sooner or later, was of no sort of consequence; and that, in giving five millions of dollars, and Texas, for it, we gave more than a just equivalent. But, if we made a sacrifice in the surrender of Texas, we ought to take care not to make too great a sacrifice in the attempt to reacquire it. My opinion of the inexpediency of the treaty of 1819, did not prevail. The country and Congress were satisfied with it, appropriations were made to carry it into effect, the line of the Sabine was recognized by us as our boundary, in negotiations both with Spain and Mexico, after Mexico became independent, and measures have been in actual progress to mark the line from the Sabine to the Red River, and thence to the Pacific Ocean. We had thus fairly alienated our title to Texas by solemn national compacts, to the fulfillment of which we stand bound by good faith and national honor. It is, therefore, perfectly idle and ridiculous, if not dishonorable, to talk of resuming our title to Texas, as if we had never parted with it. We can no more do that than Spain can resume Florida; France, Louisiana, or Great Britain the thirteen colonies now composing a part of the United States.

"During the administration of Mr. Adams, Mr. Poinsett, Minister of the United States to Mexico, was instructed by me, with the President's authority, to propose a repurchase of Texas; but he forebore even to make an overture for that purpose. Upon his return to the United States, he informed me, at New Orleans, that his reason for not making it was, that he knew the purchase

was wholly impracticable, and that he was persuaded, if he made the overture, it would have no other effect than to aggravate irritations, already existing, upon matters of difference between the two countries.

"The events which have since transpired in Texas, are well known. She revolted against the government of Mexico, flew to arms, and finally fought and won the memorable battle of San Jacinto, annihilating a Mexican army, and making a captive of the Mexican President. The signal success of that revolution was greatly aided, if not wholly achieved, by citizens of the United States, who had migrated to Texas. These successes, if they could not always be prevented by the government of the United States, were furnished in a manner, and to an extent, which brought upon us some national reproach in the eyes of an impartial world. And, in my opinion, they impose on us the obligation of scrupulously avoiding the imputation of having instigated and aided the revolution, with the ultimate view of territorial aggrandizement. After the battle of San Jacinto, the United States recognized the independence of Texas, in conformity with the principle and practice which have always prevailed in their councils of recognizing the government *de facto*, without regarding the question *de jure*. That recognition did not affect or impair the rights of Mexico, or change the relations which existed between her and Texas. She, on the contrary, has preserved all her rights, and has continued to assert, and so far as I know, still asserts, her right to reduce Texas to obedience, as a part of the republic of Mexico. According to late intelligence, it is probable that she has agreed upon a temporary suspension of hostilities; but, if that has been done, I presume it is with the purpose, upon the termination of the armistice, of renewing the war, and enforcing her rights, as she considers them.

"This narrative shows the present actual condition of Texas, so far as I have information about it. If it be correct, Mexico has not abandoned, but perseveres in the assertion of her rights by actual force of arms, which, if suspended, are intended to be renewed. Under these circumstances, if the government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would acquire along with it all the incumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. Of that consequence there can not be a doubt. Annexation and war with Mexico are identical. Now, for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the object of acquiring Texas. I know there are those who regard such a war with indifference, and as a trifling affair, on account of the weakness of Mexico, and her inability to inflict serious injury upon this country. But I do not look upon it thus lightly. I regard all wars as great calamities, to be avoided, if possible,

and honorable peace as the wisest and truest policy of this country. What the United States most need, are union, peace, and patience. Nor do I think that the weakness of a power should form a motive, in any case, for inducing us to engage in or to depreciate the evils of war. Honor and good faith and justice are equally due from this country toward the weak as toward the strong. And, if one act of injustice were to be perpetrated toward any power, it would be more compatible with the dignity of the nation, and, in my judgment, less dishonorable, to inflict it upon a powerful than upon a weak foreign nation. Have we any security that countless numbers of foreign vessels, under the authority and flag of Mexico, would not prey upon our defenseless commerce in the Mexican Gulf, on the Pacific Ocean, and on every other sea and ocean? What commerce, on the other hand, does Mexico offer, as an indemnity for our losses, or the gallantry and enterprise of our countrymen? This view of the subject supposes that the war would be confined to the United States and Mexico as the only belligerents. But, have we any certain guaranty that Mexico would obtain no allies among the great European powers? Suppose any such powers, jealous of our increasing greatness, and disposed to check our growth and cripple us, were to take part in behalf of Mexico, in the war, how would the different belligerents present themselves to Christendom and the enlightened world? We have been seriously charged with an inordinate spirit of territorial aggrandizement; and, without admitting the justice of the charge, it must be owned that we have made vast acquisitions of territory within the last forty years. Suppose Great Britain and France, or one of them, were to take part with Mexico, and by a manifesto, were to proclaim that their objects were to assist a weak and helpless ally to check the spirit of encroachment and ambition of an already overgrown Republic, seeking still further acquisitions of territory, to maintain the independence of Texas, disconnected with the United States, and to prevent the further propagation of slavery from the United States, what would be the effect of such allegations upon the judgment of an impartial and enlightened world?

"Assuming that the annexation of Texas is war with Mexico, is it competent to the treaty-making power to plunge this country into war, not only without the concurrence of, but without deigning to consult Congress, to which, by the Constitution, belongs exclusively the power of declaring war.

"I have hitherto considered the question upon the supposition that the annexation of Texas is attempted without the assent of Mexico. If she yields her assent, that would materially affect the foreign aspect of the question, if it did not remove all foreign difficulties. On the assumption of that assent, the question would be confined to the domestic considerations which belong

to it, embracing the terms and conditions upon which annexation is proposed. I do not think that Texas ought to be received into the Union, as an integral part of it, in decided opposition to the wishes of a considerable and respectable portion of the Confederacy. I think it far more wise and important to compose and harmonize the present Confederacy, than to introduce a new element of discord and distraction into it. In my humble opinion, it should be the constant and earnest endeavor of American statesmen to eradicate prejudices, to cultivate and foster concord, and to produce general contentment among all parts of our Confederacy. And true wisdom, it seems to me, points to the duty of rendering its present members happy, prosperous, and satisfied with each other, rather than to attempt to introduce alien members, against the common consent, and with the certainty of deep dissatisfaction. Mr. Jefferson expressed the opinion, and others believed, that it never was in the contemplation of the framers of the Constitution to add foreign territory to the Confederacy, out of which new states were to be formed. The acquisition of Louisiana and Florida may be defended upon the peculiar ground of the relation in which they stood to the States of the Union. After they were admitted we might well pause a while, people our vast wastes, develop our resources, prepare the means of defending what we possess, and augment our strength, power, and greatness. If hereafter further territory should be wanted for an increased population, we need entertain no apprehensions but that it will be acquired by means, it is to be hoped, fair, honorable, and constitutional.

"It is useless to disguise that there are those who espouse, and those who oppose the annexation of Texas, upon the ground of the influence which it would exert, in the balance of political power, between two great sections of the Union. I conceive that no motive for the acquisition of foreign territory would be more unfortunate, or pregnant with more fatal consequences, than that of obtaining it for the purpose of strengthening one part against another part of the common Confederacy. Such a principle, put into practical operation, would menace the existence, if it did not certainly sow the seeds of the dissolution, of the Union. It would be to proclaim to the world an insatiable and unquenchable thirst for foreign conquest or acquisition of territory. For if to-day Texas be acquired to strengthen one part of the Confederacy, to-morrow Canada may be required to add strength to another. And, after that might have been obtained, still other and further acquisitions would become necessary to equalize and adjust the balance of political power. Finally, in the progress of this spirit of universal dominion, the part of the Confederacy which is now weakest would find itself still weaker from the impossibility of securing new theaters for

those peculiar institutions which it is charged with being desirous to extend.

"But would Texas ultimately really add strength to that which is now considered the weakest part of the Confederacy? If my information be correct, it would not. According to that, the territory of Texas is susceptible of division into five States, of convenient size and form. Of these, two only would be adapted to those peculiar institutions to which I have referred; and the other three, lying west and north of San Antonio, being only adapted to farming and grazing purposes, from the nature of the soil, climate, and productions, would not admit of those institutions. In the end, therefore, there would be two slave and three free States added to the Union. If this view of the soil and geography of Texas be correct, it might serve to diminish the zeal both of those who oppose and those who are urging annexation.

"Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may. What it is, I do not know certainly; but the least I have seen it stated at, is thirteen millions of dollars. And this responsibility will exist whether there be a stipulation in the treaty or not, expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas. For I suppose it to be undeniable that if one nation becomes incorporated in another, all the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the incorporated nation, becomes the debts, and obligations, and incumbrances, and wars of the common nation created by the incorporation.

"If any European nation entertains any ambitious designs upon Texas, such as that of colonizing her, or in any way subjugating her, I should regard it as the imperative duty of the government of the United States to oppose to such designs the most firm and determined resistance, to the extent, if necessary, of appealing to arms, to prevent the accomplishment of any such designs. The Executive of the United States ought to be informed as to the aims and views of foreign powers with regard to Texas, and I presume that, if there be any of the exceptionable character which I have indicated, the Executive will disclose to the co-ordinate department of the Government, if not to the public, the evidence of them. From what I have seen and heard I believe that Great Britain has recently formally and solemnly disavowed any such aims or purposes—has declared that she is desirous only of the independence of Texas, and that she has no intention to interfere in her domestic institutions. If she has made such disavowal and declaration, I presume they are in the possession of the Executive. * * * *

"Although I have felt compelled, from the nature of the inquiries addressed to me, to extend this communication to a much greater length than I would have wished, I could not do justice

to the subject, and fairly and fully expose my own opinions, in a shorter space. In conclusion, they may be stated in a few words to be, that I consider the annexation of Texas, at this time, without the assent of Mexico, as a measure compromising the national character, involving us certainly in a war with Mexico, probably with other foreign powers, dangerous to the integrity of the Union, inexpedient in the present financial condition of the country, and not called for by any general expression of public opinion.

"I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

"H. Clay."

There are many points in this letter worthy of special notice, for their historical, prophetic, and statesman-like character. But the pervading characteristic running through every paragraph, and breathing in every line, is Mr. Clay's stern honesty and unbending integrity, both as a man and as a statesman. It is clear enough, in the opening of the letter, that he was reluctant to give credit to the atrocious scheme of forcing Texas upon the Union, in the manner proposed; and that he was even astounded, when he learned at New Orleans that the Executive of the United States [Mr. Tyler] had not only deigned to make an overture of annexation to Texas—from whence the overture should come, if made at all, under the circumstances—but that the President of the United States had actually gone so far, in connection with the other party, as to have concluded on the form and terms of a treaty of annexation, to be submitted to the Senate of the United States. An overture from Texas had previously been acted upon, and rejected. The nation acquiesced in that decision, and had slumbered on in quiet repose, and in a state of perfect unconsciousness, that the question was to be sprung upon the American people by strategy, and that strategy originating in the breast of the national Executive. It could never, at this time, have been carried by open and fair means; for that way had been tried; it must therefore be done by secret counsels, and by a secret mission to Texas. The Senate of the United States was to be taken by surprise, and carried by a *coup de main*, before the public should have time to debate the question.

Aware of the momentous character of such a transaction, nothing could be more shocking to Mr. Clay's honest feelings. Whatever might be the consequences to himself, he resolved, if possible, to arrest this iniquitous proceeding, and he sent to the "National Intelligencer" his *Raleigh Letter*.

Some may have thought that this was unwise in Mr. Clay, and that the end proved it so. It was certainly honest; and could any one, who claimed to understand Mr. Clay's character, expect that he would violate his convictions of right? True, it is acknowledged, as Mr. Clay predicted, this measure involved us in a war with Mexico; but it is said that war gave us another wide belt of territory across the continent, and it gave us California. The Mexican war, it is said, was popular, and the American people are proud of their new acquisitions. This is history.

But we have not done with this question until the course of policy and of right, indicated by Mr. Clay, is considered. Texas was sure to fall into our lap, when the fruit should be ripe, and we could have it fairly and honorably; and all that we acquired from Mexico by the war might have been bought, ere this time, for less than a moiety of the cost of the war, not to speak of the destruction of human life occasioned by the war. No one will question for a moment these two hypothetical conclusions. We had gained Louisiana, stretching to the Pacific, and Florida, by treaty stipulations, and at a reasonable price. We had even bought Texas once, and parted with it, as shown in Mr. Clay's letter; and the whole of North America was before us, for the same peaceful acquisition, as fast as we might have occasion for it. There was no call, no occasion, no possible justification of war, bloodshed, and violence, to extend our domain. It was only a question of time. It was our destiny to conquer, as far as we might desire, by peace and right; and that was the policy and the object of Mr. Clay.

But Mr. Tyler, the acting President of the United States, had betrayed the party that raised him to power, deserted their principles, and in the agony of his concern and strife to be elected President, thought it necessary to enact some grand *coup d'état*, to foist himself into that place, and he devised the atrocious scheme that is depicted in the former part of Mr. Clay's letter. "To the astonishment of the whole nation," says Mr. Clay, "we are now informed that a treaty of annexation has been actually concluded, and is to be submitted to the Senate for its consideration."

In another part of the letter, Mr. Clay says: "It is useless to disguise that there are those who espouse, and those who oppose, the annexation of Texas, on the ground of the influence

which it would exert in the balance of political power, between two great sections of the Union;" that is, between the North and South, between the free and the slave States. This movement of Mr. Tyler, then acting President, was a bid for Southern support in the nomination just about to be made for President of the United States. The general belief in the slave States was, that the annexation of Texas would be so far an extension of the area of slavery—and it was certainly a vast area in prospect. To admit this element of strife, for a balance of political power, between the free and the slave States, Mr. Clay justly regarded as fearfully portentous, because no one could calculate on its termination, but all might justly apprehend its increase and aggravation, once begun. Mr. Clay, therefore, desired to scotch the serpent in his first move.

But the bid for the South had been made, and the price was regarded as a tempting one. It did not avail, however, for Mr. Tyler, to secure his nomination; though he was in fact nominated by a small band of his own officials, which made the affair ridiculous in the eyes of the nation. It is the doom of all traitors to be despised, and to fall under the universal contempt of mankind. So was it with John Tyler. As Governor Davis, of Massachusetts, afterward Senator of the United States, commonly called "Honest John," for his exemplary probity, political as well as social, says, in a letter to Mr. Clay, found in the fourth volume of this work: "Corruption and Tyler, and Tyler and corruption, will stick together, as long as Cataline and treason."

But James K. Polk, of Tennessee, received the nomination as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and was *declared* elected, as we have before had occasion to notice. Mr. Clay was the opposing candidate of the Whig party, and was defeated in the manner which we have also noticed.

Mr. Tyler, the acting President, although he failed in the nomination, which he sought so assiduously, and at the expense of his character as a public officer, had no motive for treading back in the steps he had taken for the annexation of Texas. Having justly exposed himself to the reprobation of the Whig party, who had raised him to power, he hated them in turn, and could not love Mr. Clay, who was their chief, and who had given him such a rebuke in his *Raleigh Letter*. In sheer revenge, therefore, on the Whig party, and on Mr. Clay, as well as to

maintain his consistency, having gone so far in the matter of annexation, he still pursued that object, with all his energy as a man—not very great—and with all his influence as chief magistrate of the nation. Mr. Clay, in his letter, had frightened Mr. Tyler from any further effort to accomplish this object by the treaty-making power. Mr. Polk was declared President elect; and for the same reasons which had actuated Mr. Tyler in originating this movement, he also desired to accomplish the same end. Mr. Tyler, therefore, as acting President, and Mr. Polk as President elect, held mutual counsel, and acted in concert, for the annexation of Texas. Both were in a position to operate on the two Houses of Congress—Mr. Polk especially, as the President elect, from whom favor might be obtained during his administration. It was resolved, therefore, to sail round the treaty-making power, and annex Texas by a joint resolution of the two Houses, which was consummated the last night of Mr. Tyler's administration. Thus Texas, national dishonor, and war with Mexico, were annexed to the United States, at the moment when Mr. Tyler *went out* and Mr. Polk *came in*, by the mutual desire and efforts of these two men. The nation had no voice in it, was not consulted. So far as the nation had expressed itself, when the question was up on a former occasion, its voice was against the measure. But the Twenty-eighth Congress, the one at this time in session, was not elected with any such issue pending, and yet this was the most important and most momentous STEP ever taken by the United States. We do not call it a *measure* sanctioned by the American people; for it was never submitted to the people. It was a STEP—a STEP taken by the nation, in the acts of its Government. It is not the question, whether Texas should be annexed; for that, we consider, was an inevitable destiny. But it is the *time*, the *manner*, and the *principles* involved in the step; and the *consequences*, now past, and yet to come. The time was unseasonable; the manner was forced; the principles involved were a violation of good faith, and of public law; and the consequences are the natural product of violence. The pacific course proposed by Mr. Clay, in his *Raleigh Letter*, would, in all probability, have brought Texas into our family before this time, without our coming into collision with Mexico. For Mexico was too weak even to fight against Texas, by invading her, and the two powers would doubtless have made peace long before this; and thus we would

have annexed Texas, without war. And the rapid disorganization of Mexico, and her constant need of money, would have placed any amount of her territory which we might have wished to buy, at our disposal—not less than what we have acquired by the war, at far less cost than the war, added to the purchase of peace on the terms of the treaty. It is only by such considerations, founded upon well-known facts and moral certainties, that we can properly appreciate this subject. By this means, we know as well what would, in all probability, have happened, by regarding Mr. Clay's counsels, as what has happened by disregarding them.

And what, in fact, is the latter alternative? Precisely what Mr. Clay predicted. We had a war, which cost us a hundred millions of dollars and ten thousand men, not to speak of the cost of money and men, and loss of territory, to Mexico; and all the responsibility of the Mexican losses lie at our door, because we adopted the war by annexation. "Annexation and war with Mexico," says Mr. Clay in his letter, "are identical;" and so it proved.

But we have not only had the war and all its responsibilities, but that more abiding, and if possible still more calamitous result of arraying the North against the South, the free States against the slave States, in ever aggravating forms, which Mr. Clay also predicted would come from annexation and war, brought about with the motive of acquiring a political balance of power, which Mr. Clay said was not to be disguised. Such a domestic strife, fomented by such a cause, he predicted, was not likely to have an end, and he distinctly expressed his apprehension that it would only be aggravated by time. Such, we all know, has been the fact.

Again, Mr. Clay, in his letter, refers repeatedly to the opinion of mankind, of an enlightened world, as a providential agency, which no nation, however powerful, can safely hold in contempt. This, he feared, would be against us, in such a course. Doubtless it has been so. We are accused by the world of having made this war for territorial aggrandizement, and it will be impossible to do away with that impression.

But the disturbance of the principles, or what may fitly be called, the *morals* of Public Law, or of the Law of Nations, is one of the most important and most disastrous effects of the annexation of Texas, in the manner thereof. Although Mr. Clay

did not dwell specifically on this point, it is evidently implied in his argument.

The formation of the international code, commonly called Public Law, has been the work of many centuries, as the result of the experience and necessities of mankind in all ages of the world. It is properly a code of Public Morals between nations as individuals, in their relations to and intercourse with each other, founded upon what have been conventionally regarded and settled as sound principles of right—of justice—the disturbance of which by any nation whatever, is not only a great reproach to that nation in the eyes of the whole world, but a very great calamity, not to say crime, in the conduct of international relations. It is an assault on the recognized and established bulwarks of international civilization, and so far as it goes, it impairs their strength and efficiency. It is a treading back toward barbarism, or lawlessness, in international relations.

And yet, it can not be denied that our treatment of Mexico, in the annexation of Texas, was a breach of Public Law. Observe Mr. Clay's recognition of the rights of Mexico in the case; and those rights were determined by Public Law. In the annexation of Texas, therefore, the United States incurred all the responsibility and reproach of violating and trampling under foot the established principles of Public Law involved in the case.

If Mr. Clay had been a prophet, inspired by Heaven, he could hardly have given a truer picture of future and contingent events, than is portrayed in his *Raleigh Letter*. All that he foretold in that letter, so far as the book of events has been opened, has come to pass.

CHAPTER II.

Occupation of the Winter of 1844–'45.—General Jackson and his Party.—Not a Party of Principle.—The Whig Party.—Payment of Mr. Clay's Debts by his Friends.—Silver Vase Presented by the Gold and Silver Artisans of New York.—Statue of Mr. Clay ordered by Ladies of Richmond.—Silver Vase by Ladies of Tennessee.—Mr. Clay's Speech on receiving it.—Mr. Clay at New Orleans and St. Louis.—His Speech at New Orleans for the famishing Irish.—Letter of Thanks from two Irishmen.—Death of Colonel Henry Clay, and General Taylor's Letter to Mr. Clay announcing the sad event.—Mr. Clay's Baptism and first Communion.—Letter from Rev. Mr. Berkley, Mr. Clay's Pastor, on his Christian Character.—Anecdote to same point.—Mr. Clay's Visit to Cape May, and Interview with a Committee from New York, and Others.—Speeches.—Return to Ashland.

Mr. Clay spent the winter of 1844–'45 at Ashland, in the bosom of his family, with an immense correspondence on his hands, chiefly devoted by those addressing him, to the subject of the great disappointment at the result of the Presidential election of 1844. Extracts from this correspondence will be found in the nineteenth chapter of the second volume of this work, and a series of entire letters on the same subject, in the twelfth chapter of the fourth volume, which was first published under the title of the *Private Correspondence of Henry Clay*. The side of this correspondence addressed to Mr. Clay, was literally the pouring forth of a nation's heart in grief for a public misfortune, and in despair for the future of the country. It was like a discomfiture in a great battle for a nation's existence. A moiety of the people of the United States, endowed with nine tenths of the intellect and intelligence of the nation, and with, perhaps, an equal proportion of its wealth, had hoped for full thirty years to see Henry Clay President of the United States. Ever since 1825, the disastrous influence of the "great conspiracy," the history of which is given in the fourteenth chapter of the first volume, hung upon the neck of Mr. Clay's political fortunes like a millstone. It was one of those fatalities lying in the path

of a great man, which no human sagacity could foresee, and no opposing power avert.

General Jackson, with his military fame, was just the man to make a party of his own, not founded on principles, but a party that could accommodate itself to a total want of principle. General Jackson himself was made of rude materials, but of great force of character. He was doubtless endowed with a high order of military talent, as evinced by his brilliant victory over the British forces, on the 8th of January, 1815, for which he justly merited, and has never wanted the gratitude and honors of the nation. His rough character and military fame were the true elements which made him the head of a party that would naturally be dazzled with the latter, and never displeased with the former. It was the more uncultivated portion of the people which he drew after him. The most charitable construction of General Jackson's character, in the part he acted against Mr. Clay, in the "Great Conspiracy," is, that he allowed himself to be imposed upon, and that he was made to believe that Mr. Clay *had* bargained with Mr. Adams, to use his influence in the House of Representatives, to make Mr. Adams president, if Mr. Adams would give him the State department, and thus cut off General Jackson from the Presidency, who had the highest vote in the Electoral Colleges. The Electoral vote of 1824 was 99 for General Jackson, 84 for Mr. Adams, 41 for Mr. Crawford, and 37 for Mr. Clay—in all 261. By the Constitution, the choice lay between the first three, in the House of Representatives, and Mr. Adams was elected. It was General Jackson's interest to believe that such a bargain between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay was made, because it would be a powerful appeal to the sympathies of the nation. He professed to believe it, and was ever afterward the implacable enemy of Mr. Clay.

From that hour a party was formed, for a long time called the *Jackson* party—not a party of principle, but a personal party. An appeal was made to the less discriminating portion of the American people, to avenge the wrongs of a military chieftain, who, by means of a bargain between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, as alleged, had been unjustly barred from the Presidential chair; and that appeal was sustained by the success of General Jackson in the Presidential election of 1828, and again in 1832. It could not, therefore, be a party of principle, irrespective of men; but it was General Jackson's party; and General Jackson must always

be the opponent of Mr. Clay. Mr. Clay was a statesman; General Jackson was not a statesman. If Mr. Clay was right in the great principles he advocated for a national policy, General Jackson was wrong, for he must always take the opposite side; and unfortunately for the country, the majority of the people went for General Jackson, but not for principle. For many years, the faith of the people in General Jackson was entirely personal.

It was this peculiar origin of the party, the ruling elements of which were personal regard for General Jackson and opposition to Mr. Clay, that gave to it an unnatural, and we might, perhaps, say, an un-American character. It was not based upon American principles, but upon principles of party domination. Whatever would strengthen the party, and keep it in power, was the principle of the party; and General Jackson's name was the great principle. But such a principle could not last always, and in 1840 it broke down, by reason of the misfortunes of the country, which had come upon it for adherence to that principle.

Through all this unfortunate period, the more intelligent and more discriminating parts of the nation, who could not be seduced by the eclat of military achievements, into the ranks of a party which had no principle but faith in "the Old Hero," as General Jackson was called, adhered to the principles of public policy advocated and expounded by Mr. Clay. They believed in those principles, and waited patiently for their triumph.

In 1840 they *did* triumph; and that was the time when, if Mr. Clay had been put at the head of affairs, the policy of the country would have been fixed for fifty years, that is, forever; for it could never be changed after that. But unfortunately for the country, by the prevalence of evil counsels, Mr. Clay was not put in nomination. General Harrison died in thirty days after he was inaugurated, Mr. Tyler betrayed the party, and all was lost again to those who believed in Mr. Clay's principles, and who had trusted that the time was come for their triumph.

But Mr. Clay was still alive, and in his vigor, bravely doing battle for his principles in the Senate of the United States, and using all his endeavors to save the nation from the disasters of such a betrayal as it had encountered in the hands of Mr. Tyler. Inspired by his example, the party of the nation adhering to his principles, still hoped on, till, in May, 1844, when Mr. Clay was nominated for the Presidency, they looked forward to victory under his banner.

Is it, then, a subject of wonder, if, after having struggled for twenty years against such misfortunes, and finding themselves again overthrown, they should despair of the country, and express their feelings of despondency, as they did, in correspondence with Mr. Clay, in the winter of 1844–45?

It was during this winter that Mr. Clay received that touching testimonial of his fidelity and services to the nation which is certified in the letter of Mr. Tilford, President of the Northern Bank of Kentucky, to the author, page 44, vol. i., and in Dr. Mercer's letter to Mr. Clay, page 527 of the *Private Correspondence*, in the fourth volume of this work. When it became known, in the winter above named—not from Mr. Clay himself, but from other sources—that he had become involved in pecuniary troubles by loaning his name, and that Ashland was mortgaged for a considerable sum of money, the friends of Mr. Clay, in various parts of the country, particularly at New Orleans, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston came to his rescue, in so delicate a way, as shown in the letters above referred to, that he could not know who had done it. The struggles of Mr. Clay's mind, in accepting such a favor, were very great. Hence Dr. Mercer's advice: "Would it not be ungracious to reject the friendly hand that is tendered, to mortify those who are warmly attached to you, and to consult—shall I venture on the word?—your pride, at the expense of their feelings? My dear friend, you must submit; there is no remedy."

The sum raised in this way has been stated at $50,000. That deposited in the Northern Bank of Kentucky, as will be seen by Mr. Tilford's letter above named, was $25,750. By this means, the mortgages on Ashland were lifted, and Mr. Clay was again placed in easy circumstances, to the end of his days. It is well known that Mr. Clay was always prudent and economical in his private affairs, and not less generous in his charities and hospitalities. It was fit that he who had done so much for his country should be saved from pecuniary embarrassment, and be permitted to go down to his grave, leaving Ashland to his family, which, we believe, was their chief inheritance—an estate worth, probably, not far from $100,000. If Mr. Clay had pursued through life his profession as a lawyer and advocate, instead of devoting himself to public affairs, no one acquainted with his habits, and his unrivaled success at the bar, will doubt that he might easily have left an estate to his family of not less

than a million of dollars; and yet, in the 67th year of his age, he was reduced to the verge of bankruptcy, and would have been plunged into that gulf but for the extremely delicate and timely aid which he received, as above and elsewhere narrated in this work. The author was with Mr. Clay much during this trial—a singular trial, consisting in the struggles of his own mind about accepting this favor, which, indeed, he could not avoid, as his debts were all paid, and the mortgages on his estate lifted, by unseen and unrevealed hands. In speaking on the subject, the author several times saw the tears start from Mr. Clay's eyes, and he was forced to turn aside to conceal his own. Still, take it all in all, it was one of the eminent luxuries of the social condition of man, demonstrating, that, if republics are ungrateful, private friends are not always so. In this affair, there was, doubtless, a mixture of personal regard for Mr. Clay, and of a sense of what the American people owed to him, both of which, in the hearts of those who contrived and accomplished this object, were equally creditable.

It was in 1845 that the gold and silver artisans of New York presented to Mr. Clay, a splendid silver vase, the history of which, and of the occasion, is as follows:

At the first session of the Congress of 1842, when the Tariff was under revision, the gold and silver artisans were alarmed for their trade, when they learned that the new bill, then maturing to its passage, had reduced the duty of 12½ per cent. on gold and silver ware and jewelry, provided by the old Tariff, to 5 per cent.—a protection which they considered altogether insufficient to foster their interests.

A delegation was immediately appointed and proceeded to Washington. They had an interview with Mr. Fillmore, the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House, who expressed his apprehensions that an interference in the details of the bill, then on its third reading, would put it in great peril.

They passed directly to the Senate, where, after adjournment, they were introduced to Mr. Clay, and had a protracted conversation with him. In consequence of this interview, when the bill came up in the Senate, Mr. Clay proposed an amendment, raising the duty on silverware to 30, and that on jewelry to 25 per cent., and advocated it in one of his most persuasive speeches

—which passed the Senate, and was acquiesced in by the House.

In gratitude to Mr. Clay for this attention to their interests, the gold and silver artisans of New York, employers and journeymen, raised a subscription to present Mr. Clay with a superb silver vase, at a cost of $1000. The vase was manufactured by William Adams of New York, stands three feet high, and is of the most beautiful workmanship. The chasing is neat and elaborate, the white frost work contrasting finely with the burnished portion. The handles are light and graceful, beautifully chiseled, and fitted to the body with a gentle and symmetrical curve. Between them are two shields, one on each side. On one is depicted, in chasing, a silversmith's work shop, with the men busily employed, and on the other is engraved the following inscription :

PRESENTED TO

HENRY CLAY

BY THE

GOLD AND SILVER ARTISANS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,

AS A TRIBUTE OF THEIR RESPECT FOR THE FAITHFUL AND PATRIOTIC MANNER IN WHICH HE HAS DISCHARGED HIS PUBLIC TRUSTS, AND ESPECIALLY FOR HIS EARLY AND UNTIRING ADVOCACY OF PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY.

1845.

COMMITTEE.

WILLIAM ADAMS,	EDWARD Y. PRINCE,
M. G. BALDWIN,	DANIEL CARPENTER,
A. G. PECKHAM,	DAVID DUNN.

The richest part of the chasing is on the cover, which is surmounted by an eagle, with wings extended, as if alighting on a rock, against which the surrounding waters are vainly beating—a type of the man to whom it was presented.

In the more private history of Mr. Clay, before he again and for the last time entered on the duties of public life, it may be remarked that his time was divided in the grateful offices of domestic life, in the duties of hospitality made incumbent on a man whom all the world knew and felt an interest in calling upon, in superintending his agricultural affairs, which he always delighted in when exemption from public duty would allow of it, and in professional engagements, which never failed to fall upon him on

his return to private life. His eminent success as an advocate at the bar, caused him to be sought for to the last, in important cases of the courts.

The ladies of Richmond, Va., proud in cherishing the name of so great a son of that Commonwealth, and desirous of handing down to posterity, in the Capitol of his native State, a suitable memorial of his person, employed Mr. Joel T. Hart, a native artist of rising fame, to manipulate a statue of Mr. Clay, which has been greatly admired as a most speaking likeness of the kind, and sent him on a mission to Italy to execute it in marble. Every art employed to represent the persons of men, in their various conditions of action and repose, has been invoked to perpetuate in public and in private the memory of Mr. Clay. He has often told the author of these pages, that he desired to gratify all his friends in this particular, but that they could not easily estimate the time and patience required by the importunities of the various artists in commission for this purpose. Though Mr. Clay be dead, he will forever speak in these multifarious forms, in the statue, on the canvas, and in prints innumerable. Monument after monument will be erected to him in the public eye, and the nation will never tire of the gratitude and honor due to his services, as expressed in these memorials.

The statue of Mr. Hart, above referred to, as ordered by the ladies of Virginia, is described by a critic as follows:

"Mr. Hart has blended the idea and spirit of action with the actual presence and exhibition of repose—the latter always so essential to the highest and most agreeable effect of the sculptor's art. Mr. Clay is represented resting the weight of his body principally upon his right foot, the left being thrown a little forward, and the toes turned out. The head is sufficiently erect to give dignity and spirit to the general bearing, without approaching the offensive and vulgar line of arrogance and self-esteem, and the face is turned slightly to the right, in the direction of the corresponding arm. The fingers of the left hand rest lightly and gracefully upon a pedestal, appropriately placed, while his right arm, just fallen from an uplifted position, is sufficiently extended from the elbow to show, with the open and forward-looking palm, action just finished instead of continuous and habitual repose. The face is full of lofty animation, self-possession, and the repose of conscious power.

"The costume is a simple citizen's dress, such as Mr. Clay usually wears. The coat, unbuttoned, is loose enough not to be stiff and formal; shoes are worn instead of boots, according to Mr.

Clay's invariable custom; and the shirt-collar is turned down, not according to his custom, but as a matter of great conveniency, if not of necessity, to the artist, in the exhibition of the neck and throat."

In 1846, the ladies of Tennessee honored Mr. Clay with a silver vase, of which Doctor M'Nairy, Mr. Clay's friend, was the bearer to Ashland. When presented to Mr. Clay, in the presence of numerous guests, by a speech from the doctor, Mr. Clay made the following reply:

"Dr. M'Nairy:—It is no ordinary occurrence, nor any common mission, that honors me by your presence. To be deputed, as you have been, by a large circle of Tennessee ladies, to bear the flattering sentiment toward me which you have just so eloquently expressed, and to deliver to me the precious testimonial of their inestimable respect and regard which you have brought, is a proud incident in my life, ever to be remembered with feelings of profound gratitude and delight.

"My obligation to those ladies is not the less for the high opinion of me which they do me the honor to entertain; because I feel entirely conscious that I owe it more to their generous partiality than to any merits I possess, or to the value of any public services which I have ever been able to render.

"If, indeed, their kind wishes in relation to the issue of the last Presidential election had been gratified, I have no doubt that we should have avoided some of those public measures, so pregnant with the evils to our country, to which you have adverted. We should have preserved, undisturbed, and without hazard, peace with all the world, have had no unhappy war with a neighboring sister-republic, and, consequently, no deplorable waste of human life, of which that which has been sacrificed or impaired in an insalubrious climate, is far greater and more lamentable than what has been lost in the glorious achievements of a brave army, commanded by a skilful and gallant general.

"We should have saved the millions of treasure which that unnecessary war has and will cost—an immense amount—sufficient to improve every useful harbor on the lakes, on the ocean, on the Gulf of Mexico, and in the interior, and to remove obstructions to navigation in all the great rivers in the United States.

"We should not have subverted a patriotic system of domestic protection, fostering the industry of our own people and the interests of our own country, the great benefits which have been practically demonstrated by experience, for the visionary promises of an alien policy of free trade, fostering the industry of foreign people and the interests of foreign countries, which has brought in its train disaster and ruin to every nation that has had the

temerity to try it. The beneficial Tariff of 1842, which raised both the people and the government of the United States out of a condition of distress and embarrassment, bordering on bankruptcy, to a state of high financial and general prosperity, would now be standing unimpaired, in the statute-book, instead of the fatal Tariff of 1846, whose calamitous effects will, I apprehend, sooner or later, be certainly realized.

"All this, and more of what has since occurred in the public councils, was foretold prior to that election. It was denied, disbelieved, or unheeded; and we now realize the unfortunate consequences. But both philosophy and patriotism enjoin that we should not indulge in unavailing regrets as to the incurable past. As a part of history in which it is embodied, we may derive from it instructive lessons for our future guidance, and we ought to redouble our exertions to prevent their being unprofitably lost.

"I receive with the greatest pleasure, the splendid and magnificent vase of silver which the ladies of Tennessee, whom you represent, have charged you to present to me. Wrought by American artists, tendered by my fair countrywomen, and brought to me by an ever-faithful, ardent, and distinguished friend, it comes with a triple title to my grateful acceptance. I request you to convey to those ladies respectful and cordial assurances of my warm and heartfelt thanks and acknowledgments. Tell them I will carefully preserve, during life, and transmit to my descendants, an unfading recollection of their signal and generous manifestations of attachment and confidence. And tell them, also, that my fervent prayers shall be offered up for their happiness and prosperity, and shall be united with theirs that they may live to behold our country emerged from the dark clouds which encompass it, and once more, as in better times, standing out, a bright and cheering example, the moral and political model and guide, the hope, and the admiration, of the nations of the earth.

"I should entirely fail, Dr. M'Nairy, on this interesting occasion, to give utterance to my feelings, if I did not eagerly seize it to express to you, my good friend, my great obligations for the faithful and uninterrupted friendship which, in prosperous and adverse fortune, and amid all the vicissitudes of my checkered life, you have constantly, zealously, and fearlessly displayed. May you yet long live, in health, happiness, and prosperity, and enjoy the choicest blessings of a merciful and bountiful Providence.

A part of the winter and spring of 1846, Mr. Clay spent at New Orleans on professional business, where, as ever, he was received and entertained with public and private welcome. On his return, in April, he visited St. Louis, where he was forced to

gratify the public feeling, by receiving graciously, as he always did, the customary compliments and recognitions enthusiastically tendered to his person and to his services. A desire was manifested, in the next session of the Legislature of Kentucky, on the retirement of Governor Morehead from the Senate of the United States, that Mr. Clay should again represent the State in that body; but he declined the honor. The next winter Mr. Clay was again found at New Orleans, and attended the anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims. At the festal board he was of course toasted and brought out. The Mexican war was pending. A sportive remark, dropping from his lips on that occasion, was made the occasion of some reproach by his political opponents: "When I saw around me to-night General Brooke and other old friends, I felt half inclined to ask for some nook or corner in the army. *I have thought that I might yet be able to capture or slay a Mexican.*" The words were so reported, though their correctness has been questioned. We do not know that Mr. Clay ever condescended to put himself right, as no fair mind could fail to recognize in the language a *jeu d'esprit.* It would only be used by enemies for a malign purpose, while he was in the field of public life.

While still at New Orleans, in the early part of 1847, a public meeting was held there in behalf of suffering and famishing Ireland, and Mr. Clay was invited and urged to attend. Being still before the public, and regarded by a host of friends as still a candidate for the Presidency, he saw the delicacy of his position, and for a moment paused, lest, in advocating that cause, his motives might be misinterpreted. But it was the cause of humanity, and after "consulting his pillow," as he said, his sympathies gained the point, and he went.

Mr. Clay's speech on this occasion was a very effective one. It was precisely the field which suited the sympathies of his nature. The cause of humanity, in whatever condition of want or suffering, never appealed to him without a quick response from a feeling heart. The speech was as follows:

"Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens—I hesitated to accept the invitation which has brought me here. Being a mere sojourner, and not a member of this community, I doubted the propriety of my presence and participation in the proceedings of this meeting, and apprehended that my motive might be misunderstood. But—on consulting my pillow, and considering that

the humanity of the object of this assembly is bounded by no latitude nor locality, and ought to be co-extensive with the whole human family—it seemed to me that all considerations of fastidious delicacy and etiquette should be waived and merged into a generous and magnanimous effort to contribute to the relief of the sufferings which have excited our feelings. If I should be misconceived or misrepresented, the experience of a long life has taught me that the best response to misconception and misrepresentation, is the fearless and faithful discharge of duty, in all the conditions of life in which we may be placed; and the answer to traduction and calumny, is conscious rectitude and the approbation of one's own heart.

"Mr. President—If we were to hear that large numbers of the inhabitants of Asia, or Africa, or Australia, or the remotest part of the globe, were daily dying with hunger and famine—no matter what their color, what their religion, or what their civilization—we should deeply lament their condition, and be irresistibly prompted, if possible, to mitigate their sufferings. But it is not the distresses of any such distant regions that have summoned us together on this occasion. The appalling and heart-rending distresses of Ireland and Irishmen, form the object of our present consultation. That Ireland, which has been in all the vicissitudes of our national existence our friend, and has ever extended to us her warmest sympathy—those Irishmen, who, in every war in which we have been engaged, on every battle-field, from Quebec to Monterey, have stood by us, shoulder to shoulder, and shared in all the perils and fortunes of the conflict.

"The imploring appeal comes to us from the Irish nation, which is so identified with our own as to be almost part and parcel of ours—bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. Nor is it any ordinary case of human misery, nor a few isolated cases of death by starvation, that we are called upon to consider. Famine is stalking abroad throughout Ireland—whole towns, counties—countless human beings, of every age and of both sexes, at this very moment, are starving, or in danger of starving to death for bread. Of all the forms of dissolution of human life, the pangs and agony of that which proceeds from famine are the most dreadful. If one dies fighting gloriously for his country, he is cheered in his expiring moments by the patriotic nature of his sacrifice. He knows that his surviving relatives and friends, while lamenting his loss, will be gratified and honored by his devotion to his country. Poets, painters, sculptors, historians—will record his deeds of valor and perpetuate his renown. If he dies by the sudden explosion of the boilers of a steamboat, or by a storm at sea, death is quiet and easy, and soon performs his mission. A few piercing shrieks are uttered, he sinks beneath the surface, and all is still and silent. But a death by starvation comes slow, lingering, and excruciating.

From day to day, the wretched victim feels his flesh dwindling, his speech sinking, his friends falling around him, and he finally expires in horrible agony.

"Behold the wretched Irish mother—with haggard looks and streaming eyes—her famished children clinging to her tattered garments, and gazing piteously in her face, begging for food! And see the distracted husband-father, with pallid cheeks, standing by, horror and despair depicted in his countenance—tortured with the reflection that he can afford no succor or relief to the dearest objects of his heart, about to be snatched forever from him by the most cruel of all deaths.

"This is no fancy picture; but, if we are to credit the terrible accounts which reach us from that theater of misery and wretchedness, is one of daily occurrence. Indeed, no imagination can conceive—no tongue express—no pencil paint—the horrors of the scenes which are there daily exhibited. Ireland, in respect to food, is differently situated from all the countries of the world. Asia has her abundant supply of rice; Africa, her dates, yams, and rice; Europe, her bread of wheat, rye, and oats; America, a double resource in the small grains, and a never-failing and abundant supply of Indian corn—that great supporter of animal life, for which we are not half grateful enough to a bountiful and merciful Providence. But the staple food of large parts of poor Ireland is the potato, and when it fails, pinching want and famine follow. It is among the inscrutable dispensations of Providence, that the crop has been blighted these last two years; and hence the privation of food, and this appeal to the sympathy of American hearts.

"Shall it be in vain? Shall starving Ireland—the young and the old—dying women and children—stretch out their hands to us for bread, and find no relief? Will not this great city, the world's storehouse of an exhaustless supply of all kinds of food, borne to its overflowing warehouses by the Father of Waters, act on this occasion in a manner worthy of its high destiny, and obey the noble impulses of the generous hearts of its blessed inhabitants? We are commanded, by the common Saviour of Ireland and of us, to love one another as ourselves; and on this, together with one higher obligation, hang all the law and prophets of our holy religion. We know, that of all the forms of humanity and benevolence, none is more acceptable, in the sight of God, than the practice of charity. Let us demonstrate our love, our duty, and our gratitude to Him, by a liberal contribution to the relief of His suffering Irish children.

"Fellow-citizens, no ordinary purpose has brought us together. This is no political gathering. If it had been, you would not have seen me here. I have not come to make a speech. When the heart is full, and agitated by its own feeling emotions, the paralyzed tongue finds utterance difficult. It is not fervid elo-

quence, nor gilded words that Ireland needs—but substantial food. Let us rise to the magnitude of the duty which is before us, and by a generous supply from the magnitude of our means, evince the genuineness and cordiality of our sympathy and commiseration."

And is this the man that should pause, whatever misrepresentation or calumny might impend, and shrink from pleading the cause of a far-off famishing people, when he could speak so well and so touchingly, on a theme that moved his own heart to the utterance of such words—words of consolation and relief to the dying—words, which, on that occasion, were not spoken in vain? No, he was not that man. He had his reward in the pleasure of doing good, and the following extracts of a letter to him, from two Irishmen in New York, accompanied by a handsome present of cutlery, will show that the Irish heart can appreciate such efforts in behalf of their brethren:

"It was the good fortune of one us to hear your speech in behalf of the famishing millions of our native land, when in New Orleans on business, during that dreadful winter of 1846–7. It has since been the fortune of the other to hear and to witness in Ireland, and elsewhere in Europe, the estimation and gratitude which that speech has excited. It is our pleasing duty to thank God that your thrilling appeal to the best feelings of our common humanity was the means, by stimulating the energies of ever-blessed charity among the American people, of saving thousands of our countrymen from a death of agony and horror. It must be an abiding joy to your generous heart to know that American benevolence is devoutly blessed in parlor and cabin, where even *your* name, illustrious as it is, had hardly been heard before the famine; and that thousands have been impelled, by their deliverance from the worst effects of the dire calamity, to invoke blessings on the head of Henry Clay.

"You have often, and most appropriately, received at the hands of your countrymen, by birth, fitting acknowledgments of your services, in the shape of rare products of their unsurpassed mechanical ingenuity and skill. *Our* humble offering is the work of foreign artisans, in grateful acknowledgment of your powerful aid to an oppressed and suffering race on the other side of the Atlantic. We trust it may not, on that account, be unacceptable, but that among your many tokens of American esteem and thankfulness, a single remembrance of the tears of gratitude which, at the mention of your name, have bedewed the cheek of suffering Ireland, may not be unwelcome."

Colonel Henry Clay, third son of Mr. Clay, was born in 1811, educated at West Point, took to the law as his profession, married well, traveled a while in Europe, and returned to settle down and practice law in Louisville. The author saw Colonel Clay at Lexington in the winter of 1844–5, and was deeply impressed with the imprint of his father's countenance stamped upon his face. The son seemed the copy of the father, and worthy to represent him. He received a commission as colonel of the Kentucky regiment in the army of General Taylor, and fell in the battle of Buena Vista.

Mr. Clay had just returned from New Orleans, and while sitting at dinner one day, his son, James B. Clay, entered to announce the painful intelligence of the fall of his son Henry, at the battle of Buena Vista, the 22d of February. Not long afterward he received the following letter from General Taylor:

"Head-Quarters, Army of Occupation,
Agua Nueva, March 1, 1847.

"My dear Sir,—You will no doubt have received, before this can reach you, the deeply distressing intelligence of the death of your son in the battle of Buena Vista. It is with no wish of intruding upon the sanctuary of private sorrow, and with no hope of administering any consolation to your wounded heart, that I have taken the liberty of addressing you these few lines. But I have felt it a duty which I owe to the memory of the distinguished dead to pay a willing tribute to his many excellent qualities; and while my feelings are still fresh, to express the desolation which his untimely loss, and that of other kindred spirits, have occasioned.

"I had but a casual acquaintance with your son until he became for a time a member of my military family; and I can truly say that no one ever won more rapidly upon my regard, or established a more lasting claim to my respect and esteem. Manly and honorable in every impulse, with no feeling but for the honor of the service and of the country, he gave every assurance that in the hour of need I could lean with confidence on his support. Nor was I disappointed. Under the guidance of himself and the lamented M'Kee, gallantly did the sons of Kentucky, in the thickest of the strife, uphold the honor of the State and of the country.

"A grateful people will do justice to those who fell on that eventful day. But I may be permitted to express the bereavement which I feel in the loss of valued friends. To your son I felt bound by the strongest ties of private regard; and when I

miss his familiar face, and those of M'Kee and Hardin, I can say with truth that I feel no exultation in our success.

"With the expression of my deepest and most heart-felt sympathies for your irreparable loss, I remain your friend,

"Z. Taylor."

"Hon. Henry Clay."

If Mr. Clay had a great and strong heart for those exigences of life which put in requisition fortitude and daring, no man ever had a heart more susceptible of tenderness in the domestic and social relations, and it is remarkable that these attributes are usually found in company. As a husband and a father, Mr. Clay never failed to show himself exemplary and considerate. He loved his children, and had drunk deeply of the cup of affliction in parting with them, and in other forms of trial. In a former volume, we have had occasion to notice these bereavements. His beloved daughters had all been stricken down in early life. And now a son, in whom he might well take pride, and in whom, doubtless, the tenderest sentiments of a father's love and hope had very much centered, had fallen in a cruel hour, though in the service, and fighting the battles of his country. But a few days before, he had said at New Orleans, in his powerful appeal for famishing Ireland, "If one dies fighting gloriously for his country, he is cheered in his expiring moments by the patriotic nature of his sacrifice. His surviving relatives and friends will be gratified and honored by his devotion to his country. Poets, painters, sculptors, historians, will record his deeds of valor, and perpetuate his renown." Alas! at the very moment while the father was uttering these sentiments, it may be (we have not the dates of both events, but they were not far apart) the son lay bleeding on the field of Buena Vista! The father was a painter in his speech, and did his work well. And yet he found his speech was false, so far as it depicted "gratification of surviving relatives and friends," at the fall of their kindred in battle, though it be in the service of their country. Nature is stronger than the artificial sentiments of glory. Doubtless the fall of friends in such a service is afterward a consolation. But the first and soul-absorbing sentiment of the father is: "O, Absalom, my son, my son!"

Mr. Clay, doubtless, was well enough pleased that his son should engage in that service, and he was aware of its hazards. But there was hope of his safe return, and a conviction that he

would acquit himself with honor. Life is a battle, and death awaits the combatants. We know what hope is, but we know not bereavement till it comes; and then the head is bowed low. Silent submission to the awards of Providence is the sole expression that befits the hour. We can go no further into the secrets of a father's bosom when his son falls. God only is acquainted with his sorrows.

We come now to notice a very interesting event at this late period of Mr. Clay's life, narrated in the following extract from a letter dated at Lexington, June 25th, 1847:

"A notice was very generally circulated through the public papers of the country, some two or three years ago, to the effect that Mr. Clay had become a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The wish was doubtless father to the thought, as Mr. Clay had not at that time taken any such step. He has always been known to have the highest respect for the institutions of Christianity, and to have been a decided believer in the Divine authenticity of the Christian religion—his amiable and now deeply-afflicted wife having, for many years, been a humble follower of its blessed Author. When the weather permitted it, living as he does a mile and a half from church, Mr. Clay has always been a regular attendant on its services; and for two or three years past, having had more leisure from public duty, his attention had evidently been turned to the high considerations connected with things spiritual and eternal—his life having been devoted so intensely to the good of others, as scarcely, until this period of retirement, to leave him an opportunity to think of himself. But he has at length consecrated his great powers to God. He was baptized in the little parlor at Ashland, on Tuesday, the 22d instant, together with one of his daughters-in-law (the other being already a member of the Church) and her four children, by the Rev. Edward F. Berkley, rector of Christ Church, Lexington. The baptism was administered privately, for the reason that the congregation of Christ Church are replacing their old church with a new edifice, now in rapid progress of erection, and are not suitably situated for the most solemn and decent administration of this rite in public.

"When the minister entered the room, on this deeply solemn and interesting occasion, the small assembly, consisting of the immediate family, a few family connections, and the clergyman's wife, rose up. In the middle of the room stood a large center-table, on which was placed, filled with water, the magnificent cut-glass vase presented to Mr. Clay by some gentlemen of Pittsburg. On one side of the room hung the large picture of the family of Washington, himself an Episcopalian by birth, by

education, and a devout communicant of the Church; and immediately opposite, on a side table, stood the bust of the lamented Harrison, with a chaplet of withered flowers hung upon his head, who was to have been confirmed in the Church the Sabbath after he died—fit witnesses of such a scene. Around the room were suspended a number of family pictures, and among them the portrait of a beloved daughter, who died some years ago, in the triumphs of that faith which her noble father was now about to embrace; and the picture of the late lost son, who fell at the battle of Buena Vista. Could these silent lookers-on at the scene about transpiring, have spoken from the marble and the canvas, they would heartily have approved the act which dedicated the great man to God. There was a deep emotion pervading that small assembly, at the recital, under such circumstances, of the sublime ordinal of the Church."

The author visited Ashland in November, 1852, and accidentally took up from the table in the parlor an elegantly bound Prayer-book, on the first blank page of which he found the two following records in Mr. Clay's own hand:

"Presented to me by Mrs. Pinca, of New Orleans, in February, 1847. H. Clay."

"I was christened the 22d of June, 1847, by the Rev. Mr. Berkley, of Christ Church, in the city of Lexington, in my house at Ashland, according to the forms of the Episcopal Church. I partook of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper the fourth day of July, 1847, in the Chapel of Transylvania University, in Lexington; and on the 15th day of the same month, I was confirmed in the same chapel, by the Right Rev. Bishop Smith. H. Clay."

The following are extracts of a letter, written in 1852, from the Rev. Edward F. Berkley, Mr. Clay's pastor above named, to the Rev. Dr. Butler, Washington, D. C., touching Mr. Clay's religious character:

"I have been acquainted with Mr. Clay and his family for seventeen years, and for the last fourteen years have been rector of the church in which they worshiped; and have known them as a pastor usually knows his people. In his words and actions, Mr. Clay always expressed a very high respect for the institutions of religion, and great confidence in its Divine authenticity. He usually attended church with his family once a day on the Sabbath, when he was at home; but not so regularly *before* as *after* he joined the church. He evidently came to think more

seriously and feel more deeply on the subject of religion, two or three years before he avowed his purpose to embrace it.

"At the time of his baptism, our present church edifice was in the course of construction, and we worshiped in the best place we could find. Under these circumstances he preferred being baptized at home. * * * * The vessel which contained the water from which he was baptized, was a very large cut-glass vase, presented to him by a manufacturer of such ware in the city of Pittsburg.

"When I was about to begin the service, his family and several friends being present, I saw that he had no Prayer-book, and suggested that he might be aided in answering the questions in the service by using one. He replied, 'I think I shall be able to answer them;' and he did answer them with great emphasis and deep emotion.

"Mr. Clay felt a lively interest in the prosperity of the church, and concerned himself much in the erection of our present church edifice. He attended all the meetings of the congregation that were called, with a view of giving point and efficiency to our plans, and aided by his counsel and his means in bringing the work to a successful completion.

"I never knew a person to be more deeply interested in arriving at the *truth* in religion than Mr. Clay. He did nothing by halves. In all that relates to man's salvation, he wished to understand the Christian system thoroughly. * * * * After his mind had been drawn to an investigation of the claims of religion upon himself, I scarcely ever met him at his office or at his house, that conversation did not turn upon this subject, in the course of which he would ask many questions in reference to the doctrines and teachings of Scripture. On one occasion, about three years ago, he became very ill. Being absent from the city, I did not see him until he had got better. When I entered his room, he arose, and taking my hand in both of his, he said, with tears in his eyes, 'My dear sir, I am very glad to see you. I have been ill; I have been very near the grave; and I was surprised at the composure, and even pleasure, with which I was permitted to look into it.' Of his deep earnestness in a preparation for that better world, from his first assumption of the vows of religion, I have always been well assured."

Mr. Berkley speaks above of Mr. Clay's having "thought more seriously on the subject of religion for two or three years before he avowed his purpose to embrace it." In coincidence with this remark, the author of these pages would add that, in the winter of 1844–45, Mr. Clay one day asked him, "if he could recommend some work that would lead an inquirer after religious truths from *without*, to its more vital parts *within?*" The au-

thor mentioned a work which he thought was pertinent, and the next day saw it on Mr. Clay's table, who said he had begun to read it, and was pleased. On a Sunday evening, about the same time, the author and a gentleman from Boston were sitting with Mr. Clay in his parlor, when the conversation turned on some of the dark aspects of general society. A Bible lay on the center table, elegantly bound, in two volumes, and inscribed on the outside, in gold letters, "*Presented by the Ladies of Hartford*," (Conn). It appeared to have been placed there for Sunday use. Mr. Clay, pointing to it, said, "That, gentlemen, is the only book to give us hope in darkness."

We come, then, to an epoch in Mr. Clay's life, from which we are to regard him as a Christian. This notice of his character, in this particular, will not be thought impertinent by those who respect the truth of history, and who would desire a faithful picture of the life of such a man. Before this time, he was ever a true American patriot; from this time, he was the Christian Statesman.

In August of this year, Mr. Clay made a visit to Cape May, for sea air and bathing, and took Philadelphia *en route*. His presence in that city, as usual, was the occasion of some sensation among his friends, who desired to honor him. Indeed, the manifestations of public regard were of a very decided character—enthusiastic. In this, there was doubtless a strong element of sympathy for his recent overwhelming bereavement. The people could not be satisfied without seeing him, and hearing his voice again, if only to thank them for their kindness, and to say, "Good-night." He said a few words to the immense concourse in the street, from the balcony of his host, Mr. Henry White, with a touching allusion to the loss of his son, which drew tears from all eyes, and intimated the need he had of repose. He said he had left in part to escape from feelings that preyed upon him, and was happy in the evidences of sympathy which he every where met with. God was good, and his friends were still kind. The first was a religious consolation, and the second a favor which he highly appreciated.

Cape May, however, was no retirement for Mr. Clay. The world followed him, and delegations from different cities paid him their respects. On a day and hour appointed, Mr. Nicholas Dean of New York, addressed Mr. Clay as follows:

"Through the unexpected kindness of friends, I am the honored instrument of expressing to you, sir, briefly, sentiments which are common to us all. * * * * We come in the name of four hundred thousand persons, to ask you once more to visit our metropolis. * * * * Permit us, we pray you, sir, to announce to our friends, with the speed of lightning, that Henry Clay will come to them. * * * * The great aggregate heart of our city is throbbing to bid you welcome, thrice welcome, to its hospitalities."

Mr. Clay replied:

"Gentlemen of the committee from New York; gentlemen of the committee from Trenton; gentlemen of the committee from New Haven; gentlemen of the committee from Philadelphia: Fellow-citizens—In all the uprightness of nature which I have ever endeavored to practice, I must tell you the objects and motives which have brought me to the shores of the Atlantic. I returned to my residence, after passing the winter at New Orleans, on the twenty-third or twenty-fourth day of March last; and in a day or two afterward, melancholy intelligence reached me. [Here Mr. Clay evinced great emotion.] I have been nervous ever since, and was induced to take this journey; for I could not look upon the partner of my sorrows without feeling deeper anguish. [The speaker was here overcome by his feelings, and paused some minutes, covering his face with his hands. At length, recovering himself, he resumed.] Every thing about Ashland was associated with the memory of the lost one. The very trees which his hands assisted me to plant, served to remind me of my loss. Had the stroke come alone, by Divine assistance, and sustained by the kindness of my friends and fellow-citizens, I could have borne it with meekness and resignation. But of eleven children, four only now remain, [Great emotion.] Of six lovely daughters, not one is left. Finding myself in that theater of sadness, I thought I would fly to the mountain's top, and descend to the ocean's wave, and by meeting with the sympathy of friends, obtain some relief for the sadness which surrounded me. I came for private purposes, and from private motives alone. I have not sought these public manifestations, nor have I desired to escape them. My friend and traveling companion, Dr. Mercer, will tell you, that in Virginia—in every section of the State of my birth—I have been implored to remain, if only for a few hours, to exchange congratulations with my friends; but I invariably refused, and only staid in each place sufficiently long to exchange one vehicle for another. * * * I had no public object in view. Indifferent I am not, and can not be, to the honor, welfare, and glory of my country.

"Gentlemen, I have truly and sincerely disclosed the purpose of my journey; but I can not but deeply feel this manifestation of your respect and regard. It is received with thankfulness, and reaches the warmest feelings of my heart, that I, a private and humble citizen, without an army, without a navy, without even a constable's staff, should have been met, at every step of my progress, with the kindest manifestations of feeling—manifestations of which, at present, a monarch or an emperor might well be proud. [Great applause.] No, I am not insensible to these tokens of public affection and regard: I am thankful for them all. [Cheers.]

"Gentlemen of the committees of New York, of Trenton, of New Haven, and of Philadelphia—I must reluctantly decline the honor of your invitations, and beg of you to excuse me. I trust to the affection of those whom you represent, to excuse me; for if I do not place myself on the affections of my countrymen, whither should I go, and where should I be? On the wide ocean, without a compass, and without a guide. [Very great applause.] I must beg of you, gentlemen of all these committees, to retrace your steps, charged and surcharged with my warmest feelings of gratitude."

From Cape May, Mr. Clay returned to Ashland, after a month's absence, with improved health and spirits. He had been among friends; he needed it. There is no man so great and strong in mind, or so self-relying, who, when stricken down by affliction, may not be consoled by sympathy. Public admiration was Mr. Clay's rightful inheritance; he was equally secure of public sympathy in a time of need, nor did he fail to receive it.

CHAPTER III.

Mr. Clay's feelings on the Mexican War.—His Speech at Lexington, and Resolutions on the War.—A Defect of the Federal Constitution.—Popular Action in response to Mr. Clay's Speech.—Mr. Clay at Washington.—His Speech before the Colonization Society.—Mr. Clay in the Supreme Court.—Death of Mr. Adams.—Mr. Clay's Reception at Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York.

The war with Mexico broke out in February, 1846, in the first year of Mr. Polk's administration. Mr. Clay, always for peace, when it could be maintained with honor to the country, was opposed to the annexation of Texas, as we have before seen, on the ground that it must necessarily lead to war, that it was in fact the adoption of the state of hostilities between Texas and Mexico, which, though inactive, was nevertheless pending; and in the progress of annexation, the Government of Mexico served a formal notice on the Government of the United States that annexation would be viewed in the light of a declaration of war. But, as the strong too often disregard the menaces of the weak, this notice was of little avail, and Mr. Tyler, before the close of his administration, through the joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, had consummated the act, and handed over the country to his successor, Mr. Polk—not ungrateful to the latter—with this millstone of war upon its neck.

Mr. Clay, in his celebrated *Raleigh Letter* of April 17th, 1844, said, "Annexation and war with Mexico are identical;" and so it turned out. The spirit of the country, unfortunately, more especially of the dominant party, was not extremely averse to war, in the case and in the circumstances; and Mr. Polk had only to contrive a pretext, easily found, to commit the nation to the hazard and its consequences. A large portion of the western domain of Texas, as now described, was disputed territory, occupied by Mexicans, and under Mexican rule, at the time of and after annexation. In 1845, the first year of Mr. Polk's administration, General Taylor and his little army were posted at Cor-

pus Christi, on the seaboard, and contiguous to the eastern border of the disputed ground. He was ordered to march and take up his position on the Rio Grande, opposite Matamoras, thus traversing the disputed territory from its eastern to its western border, and violating its conditions as established by Public Law. The Mexican army, posted on the opposite side of the river, immediately commenced hostilities, and soon after followed the battles of Palo Alto, and of Resaca de la Palma. The war with Mexico was begun. How it was conducted, and how it was terminated, by the victorious arms of General Taylor and of General Scott, are matters of history. Peace was at last dictated to Mexico, in her reduced and humbled condition, not without some generous considerations, but with a surrender of a large belt of her northern territories, extending from the Rio Grande to the Pacific, including California, the land of gold, though its immense wealth and great importance as an integral portion of the American Union, were not at that time appreciated. Those vast acquisitions of territory, and the subsequent development of their resources, have made the Mexican war popular in the United States, and no attempt to raise general discontent on that account, has ever succeeded. Territorial aggrandizement and the extension of political sway, seem to be one of the aspirations of republics. How soon, if ever, this feeling of the American people will be rebuked by Providence, we do not profess competency to say.

But Mr. Clay always looked upon such conquests, not only with diffidence, but with profound concern. He preferred narrower limits, in the hope of more abiding security, and of certain and permanent prosperity. There is, perhaps, some ground of expectation that the peculiar constitutional frame of the Federal Government, in giving to each of the United States such a quantum of sovereignty, will be an enduring bond of the Union; and that this Union, instead of being dissolved, will only grow stronger by time and stern trials. But Mr. Clay had his fears, though no one, knowing his character, would pronounce him a timid statesman. A more courageous heart never beat in the breast of man, when a fit occasion for its exemplification presented, whether for private or public ends. But he was conscientious; "I would rather be right than be President." This well-earned claim, which cost him more than once or twice the sacrifice of the Presidential chair, will go down to posterity with

infinitely more glory to him than the brightest diadem of earth. It will burn, and blaze, and increase in splendor, as time rolls on; while the names of his successful competitors will be forgotten. Though given by himself, with no purpose of eclat, it describes the man, and all the world know it.

Mr. Clay could not feel that it was right to go to war with Mexico. He was a lion, satisfied with a legitimate subsistence, that would not pounce on weak and defenseless game, nor provoke it, in mere wantonness, to a hopeless struggle.

As we are giving the biography of Mr. Clay, and, in this case, his general feeling on the subject of the Mexican war, and not writing the history of that war, or a vindication of the country in waging and carrying it on, or telling the story of its generally acceptable results, it is our business to give Mr. Clay's views, in regard to it, as a part of his own personal history.

It was on the 13th of November, 1847, when the city of Mexico was in the possession of General Scott, and the whole of Mexico at our feet, and the great question of the terms of peace was pending, that Mr. Clay, called upon from all parts of the Union, to give his advice, not as a public man—for he was in retirement—but as a private citizen, delivered his memorable speech on the war, before an immense concourse of his fellow citizens at Lexington.

We shall give only a few extracts, though it was three hours long. The day was unpleasant. Hence the exordium:

"The day is dark and gloomy, unsettled and uncertain, like the condition of our country in regard to the unnatural war with Mexico. The public mind is agitated and anxious, and is filled with serious apprehensions as to its indefinite continuance, and especially as to the consequences which its termination may bring forth, menacing the harmony, if not the existence, of our Union. It is under these circumstances I present myself before you. No ordinary occasion would have drawn me from the retirement in which I live; but, while a single pulsation of the human heart remains, it should, if necessary, be dedicated to the service of one's country. And I have hoped that, although I am a private and humble citizen, an expression of the views and opinions I entertain might form some little addition to the general stock of information, and afford a small assistance in delivering our country from the perils and dangers which surround it. * * * * *

"I have come here with no purpose to attempt to make a fine

speech, or any ambitious oratorical display. I have brought with me no rhetorical bouquets to throw into this assemblage. In the circle of the year autumn has come, *and the season of flowers has passed away.* In the progress of years, my spring-time has gone by, and I, too, am in the autumn of life, and feel the frost of age. My desire and aim are to address you earnestly, calmly, seriously, and plainly, upon the grave and momentous subjects which have brought us together. And I am most solicitous that not a solitary word may fall from me offensive to any party or person in the whole extent of the Union. * * *

"War, pestilence, famine, by the common consent of mankind, are the three greatest calamities which can befall our species; and war, as the most direful, justly stands in front. Pestilence and famine, no doubt for wise although inscrutable purposes, are inflictions of Providence, to which it is our duty, therefore, to bow with obedience, humble submission, and resignation. Their duration is not long, and their ravages are limited. They bring, indeed, great affliction while they last, but society soon recovers from their effects. War is the voluntary work of our own hands, and whatever reproaches it may deserve should be directed to ourselves. When it breaks out, its duration is indefinite and unknown—its vicissitudes are hidden from our view. In the sacrifice of human life, and in the waste of human treasure, in its losses and its burdens, it affects both belligerent nations; and its sad effects of mangled bodies, of death and of desolation, endure long after its thunders are hushed in peace. War unhinges society, disturbs its peaceful and regular industry, and scatters poisonous seeds of disease and immorality, which continue to germinate and diffuse their baneful influences long after it has ceased. Dazzling by its glitter, pomp, and pageantry, it begets a spirit of wild adventure and romantic enterprise, and often disqualifies those who embark in it, after their return from the bloody fields of battle, from engaging in the industrious and peaceful vocations of life.

"We are informed by a statement, which is apparently correct, that the number of our countrymen slain in this lamentable Mexican war, although it has yet been of only eighteen months' existence, is equal to one half of the whole of the American loss during the seven years' war of the Revolution! And I venture to assert that the expenditure of treasure which it has occasioned when it shall come to be fairly ascertained and footed up, will be found to be more than half of the pecuniary cost of the war of our independence. And this is the condition of the party whose arms have been every where constantly victorious! * * * * *

"How did we unhappily get involved in this war? It was predicted, as a consequence, of the annexation of Texas to the United States. If we had not Texas, we should have had no

war. * * * * Notwithstanding a state of virtual war necessarily resulted from the fact of the annexation of one of the belligerents to the United States, actual hostilities might probably have been averted by prudence, moderation, and wise statesmanship. If General Taylor had been permitted to remain where his own good sense prompted him to believe he ought to remain, at Corpus Christi; and if a negotiation had been opened with Mexico, in a true spirit of amity and consideration, war, possibly, might have been prevented. But, instead of this peaceful and moderate course, while Mr. Slidell was bending his way to Mexico, with his diplomatic credentials, General Taylor was ordered to transport his cannon and plant them in a warlike attitude opposite to Matamoras, on the east bank of the Rio Bravo, within the very disputed territory, the adjustment of which was to be the object of Mr. Slidell's mission. What else could have transpired but a conflict of arms?

"Thus, the war commenced; and the President, after having produced it, appealed to Congress. A bill was prepared to raise fifty thousand volunteers, and in order to commit all who should vote for it, a preamble was inserted, falsly attributing the commencement of the war to the act of Mexico. I have no doubt of the patriotic motives of those who, after struggling to divest the bill of that flagrant error, found themselves constrained to vote for it. But I must say that no earthly consideration would have ever tempted or provoked me to vote for a bill with a palpable falsehood stamped on its face. Almost idolizing truth as I do, I never could have voted for that bill.

"Does any considerate man believe it possible that two such immense countries, with territories of nearly equal extent, with populations so incongruous, so different in race, in language, in religion, and in laws, could be blended together in one harmonious mass, and happily governed by one common authority? Murmurs, discontents, insurrections, rebellion, would inevitably ensue, until the incompatible parts would be broken asunder and possibly, in the frightful struggle, our present glorious Union itself would be dissevered or dissolved. We ought not to forget the warning voice of all history, which teaches the difficulty of combining and consolidating together, conquering and the conquered nations. After the lapse of eight hundred years, during which the Moors held their conquest of Spain, the idomitable courage, perseverance, and obstinacy of the Spanish race finally triumphed, and expelled the African invaders from the peninsula. And, even within our own time, the colossal power of Napoleon, when at its loftiest height, was incompetent to subdue and subjugate the proud Castilian. And here, in our own neighborhood, Lower Canada, which near one hundred years ago, after the conclusion of the seven years' war, was ceded by France to Great Britain, remains a foreign land in the midst of British

provinces, foreign in feeling and attachment, and foreign in laws, language, and religion. And what has been the fact with poor, gallant, generous, and oppressed Ireland? Centuries have passed since the overbearing Saxon overrun and subjugated the Emerald Isle. Rivers of Irish blood have flowed during the long and arduous contest. Insurrection and rebellion have been the order of the day; and yet, up to this time, Ireland remains alien in feeling, affection, and sympathy, toward the power which has so long borne her down. Every Irishman hates, with a mortal hatred, his Saxon oppressor. Although there are great territorial differences between the condition of England and Ireland, as compared to that of the United States and Mexico, there are some points of striking resemblance between them. Both the Irish and the Mexicans are probably of the same Celtic race. Both the English and the Americans are of the same Saxon origin. The Catholic religion predominates in both the former, the Protestant among both the latter. Religion has been the fruitful cause of dissatisfaction and discontent between the Irish and the English nations. Is there no reason to apprehend that it would become so between the people of the United States and those of Mexico, if they were united together? Why should we seek to interfere with them in their mode of worship of a common Saviour? We believe that they are wrong, especially in the exclusive character of their faith, and that we are right. They think that they are right and we wrong. What other rule can there be than to leave the followers of each religion to their own solemn convictions of conscientious duty toward God? Who, but the great Arbiter of the Universe, can judge in such a question? For my own part, I do sincerely believe and hope, that those who belong to all the departments of the great Church of Christ, if, in truth and purity, they conform to the doctrines which they profess, will ultimately secure an abode in those regions of bliss which all aim finally to reach.

"But I suppose it to be impossible that those who favor, if there be any who favor the annexation of Mexico to the United States, can think that it ought to be perpetually governed by military sway. Certainly no votary of human liberty could deem it right that a violation should be perpetrated of the right principles of our own Revolution, according to which, laws ought not to be enacted and taxes ought not to be levied, without representation on the part of those who are to obey the one and pay the other. Then, Mexico is to participate in our councils, and equally share in our legislation and government. But, suppose she would not voluntarily choose representatives to the national Congress, is our soldiery to follow the electors to the ballot-box, and by force to compel them, at the point of the bayonet, to deposit their ballot? And how are the nine millions of Mexican people to be represented in the Congress of the

United States of America, and the Congress of the United States of the Republic of Mexico combined? Is every Mexican, without regard to color or taste, *per capitum*, to exercise the elective franchise? How is the quota of representation between the two republics to be fixed? Where is the seat of common government to be established? And who can foresee or foretell, if Mexico, voluntarily or by force, were to share in the common government, what could be the consequences to her or to us? Unprepared, as I fear her population yet is, for the practical enjoyment of self-government, and of habits, customs, language, laws, and religion, so totally different from our own, we should present the revolting spectacle of a confused, distracted, and motley government. We should have a Mexican party, a Pacific Ocean party, an Atlantic party, in addition to the other parties which exist, or with which we are threatened, each striving to execute its own particular views and purposes, and reproaching the others with thwarting and disappointing them. The Mexican representation, in Congress, would probably form a separate and impenetrable corps, always ready to throw itself into the scale of any other party, to advance and promote Mexican interests. Such a state of things could not long endure. Those whom God and geography have pronounced should live asunder, could never be permanently and harmoniously united together.

"Do we want for our own happiness or greatness the addition of Mexico to the existing Union of our States? If our population were too dense for our territory, and there was a difficulty in obtaining honorably the means of subsistence, there might be some excuse for an attempt to enlarge our dominions. But we have no such apology. We have already, in our glorious country, a vast and almost boundless territory. Beginning at the north, in the frozen regions of the British provinces, it stretches thousands of miles along the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean and the Mexican Gulf, until it almost reaches the tropics. It extends to the Pacific Ocean, borders on those great inland seas, the lakes, which separate us from the possessions of Great Britain, and it embraces the great father of rivers, from its uppermost source to the Balize, and the still longer Missouri, from its mouth to the gorges of the Rocky Mountains. It comprehends the greatest variety of the richest soils, capable of almost all the productions of the earth, except tea and coffee and the spices, and it includes every variety of climate which the heart could wish or desire. We have more than ten thousand millions of acres of waste and unsettled lands, enough for the subsistence of ten or twenty times our present population. Ought we not to be satisfied with such a country? Ought we not to be profoundly thankful to the Giver of all good things for such vast and bountiful land? Is it not the height of ingratitude to Him to seek, by war and conquest, indulging in a spirit of rapacity, to acquire other lands, the homes

and habitations of a large portion of His common children? If we pursue the object of such a conquest, besides mortgaging the revenue and resources of this country for ages to come, in the form of an onerous national debt, we should have greatly to augment that debt, by an assumption of the sixty or seventy millions of the national debt of Mexico. For I take it that nothing is more certain than that, if we obtain voluntarily or by conquest a foreign nation, we acquire it with all the incumbrances attached to it. In my humble opinion, we are now bound, in honor and morality, to pay the just debt of Texas. And we should be equally bound, by the same obligations, to pay the debt of Mexico if it were annexed to the United States. * * * *

"It may be argued that, in admitting the injustice of slavery, I admit the necessity of an instantaneous reparation of that injustice. Unfortunately, however, it is not always safe, practicable, or possible, in the great movements of states and public affairs of nations, to remedy or repair the infliction of previous injustice. In the inception of it, we may oppose and denounce it, by our most strenuous exertions, but, after its consummation, there is often no other alternative left us but to deplore its perpetration, and to acquiesce, as the only alternative, in its existence, as a less evil than the frightful consequences which might ensue from the vain endeavor to repair it. Slavery is one of those unfortunate instances. The evil of it was inflicted upon us by the parent country of Great Britain, against all the entreaties and remonstrances of the colonies. And here it is among and amid us, and we must dispose of it as best we can under all the circumstances which surround us. It continued, by the importation of slaves from Africa, in spite of colonial resistance, for a period of more than a century and a half, and it may require an equal or longer lapse of time before our country is entirely rid of the evil. And, in the mean time, moderation, prudence, and discretion, among ourselves, and the blessings of Providence, may be all necessary to accomplish our ultimate deliverance from it. Examples of similar infliction of irreparable national evil and injustice might be multiplied to an indefinite extent. The case of the annexation of Texas to the United States is a recent and an obvious one, which, if it were wrong, can not now be repaired. Texas is now an integral part of our Union, with its own voluntary consent. Many of us opposed the annexation with honest zeal and most earnest exertions. But who would now think of perpetrating the folly of casting Texas out of the Confederacy, and throwing her back upon her own independence, or into the arms of Mexico? Who would now seek to divorce her from this Union? The Creeks and the Cherokee Indians were, by the most exceptionable means, driven from their country, and transported beyond the Mississippi river. Their lands have been

fairly purchased and occupied by inhabitants of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee. Who would now conceive the flagrant injustice of expelling those inhabitants and restoring the Indian country to the Cherokees and Creeks, under color of repairing the original injustice? During the war of our Revolution, millions of paper money were issued by our ancestors, as the only currency with which they could achieve our liberty and independence. Thousands and tens of thousands of families were stripped of their homes and their all, and brought to ruin, by giving credit and confidence to that spurious currency. Stern necessity has prevented the reparation of that great national injustice.

"Shall this war be prosecuted for the purpose of conquering Mexico, and annexing it, in all its extent, to the United States? I will not attribute to the President of the United States any such design; but I confess I have been shocked and alarmed by the manifestations of it in various quarters. Of all the dangers and misfortunes which could befall this nation, I should regard that of its becoming a warlike and conquering power, the most direful and fatal. History tells the mournful tale of conquering nations and conquerors. The three most celebrated conquerors in the civilized world were Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon. The first, after overrunning a large portion of Asia, and sighing and lamenting that there were no more worlds to subdue, met a premature and ignoble death. His lieutenants quarreled and warred with each other for the spoils of his victories, and finally lost them all. Cæsar, after conquering Gaul, returned with his triumphant legions to Rome, passed the Rubicon, won the battle of Pharsalia, tramped upon the liberties of his country, and expired by the patriotic hand of Brutus. But Rome ceased to be free. War and conquest had enervated and corrupted the masses. The spirit of true liberty was extinguished, and a long line of emperors succeeded, some of whom were the most execrable monsters that ever existed in human form. And that most extraordinary man, perhaps, in all history, Napoleon, after subjugating all continental Europe, occupying almost all its capitals—seriously threatening, according to M. Thiers, proud Albion herself—and decking the brows of various members of his family with crowns torn from the heads of other monarchs, lived to behold his own dear France itself in the possession of his enemies, and was himself made a wretched captive, and, far removed from country, family, and friends, breathed his last on the distant and inhospitable rock of St. Helena. The Alps and the Rhine had been claimed as the natural boundaries of France, but even these could not be secured in the treaties to which she was forced to submit. Do you believe that the people of Macedon or Greece, of Rome or of France, were benefited individually or collectively by the triumphs of their great captains? Their sad lot

was immense sacrifice of life, heavy and intolerable burdens, and the ultimate loss of liberty itself. * * *

"Of all the possessions that belong to man, in his collective or individual condition, none should be preserved and cherished with more sedulous and unremitting care than that of an unsullied character. It is impossible to estimate it too highly in society, when attached to an individual, nor can it be exaggerated or too greatly magnified in a nation. Those who lose or are indifferent to it, become just objects of scorn and contempt. Of all the abominable transactions which sully the pages of history, none exceed in enormity that of the dismemberment and partition of Poland by the three great continental powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Ages may pass away, and centuries roll around; but so long as human records endure, all mankind will unite in execrating the rapacious and detestable deed. That was accomplished by overwhelming force, and by the unfortunate existence of fatal dissensions and divisions in the bosom of Poland. That the power of the United States is competent to the conquest of Mexico, is quite probable. But let us avoid affixing to our name and national character a similar, if not a worse stigma than that involved in the partition of Poland. I am afraid that we do not now stand well in the opinion of other parts of Christendom. Repudiation has brought upon us much reproach. All the nations, I apprehend, look upon us, in the prosecution of the present war, as being actuated by a spirit of rapacity, and an inordinate desire for territorial aggrandizement."

At the close of this speech, which was one of the great efforts of Mr. Clay's life, and delivered in his 71st year, he submitted the following resolutions:

"1. *Resolved*, As the opinion of this meeting, that the primary cause of the present unhappy war, existing between the United States of America and the United States of the republic of Mexico, was the annexation of Texas to the former; and that the immediate occasion of hostilities between the two republics arose out of the order of the President of the United States for the removal of the army under the command of General Taylor, from its position at Corpus Christi, to a point opposite Matamoras, on the east bank of the Rio Bravo, within territory claimed by both republics, but then under the jurisdiction of that of Mexico, and inhabited by its citizens; and that the order of the President, for the removal of the army to that point was improvident and unconstitutional, it being without the concurrence of Congress, or even any consultation with it, although it was in session: but that Congress having, by subsequent acts, recognized the war thus brought into existence, without its previous authority or consent, the prosecution of it became thereby national.

"2. *Resolved*, That in the absence of any formal and public declaration by Congress of the objects for which the war ought to be prosecuted, the President of the United States, as chief magistrate, and as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, is left to the guidance of his own judgment to prosecute it for such purposes and objects as he may deem the honor and interest of the nation to require.

"3. *Resolved*, That by the Constitution of the United States, Congress, being invested with power to declare war, and grant letters of marque and reprisal, to make rules concerning captures on land and water, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government of the land and naval forces, has the full and complete war-making power of the United States; and, so possessing it, has a right to determine upon the motives, cause, and objects, of any war, when it commences, or at any time during the progress of its existence.

"4. *Resolved*, As the further opinion of this meeting, that it is the right and duty of Congress to declare by some authentic act, for what purposes and objects the existing war ought to be further prosecuted; that it is the duty of the President in his official conduct to conform to such a declaration of Congress; and that if, after such declaration, the President should decline or refuse to endeavor, by all the means, civil, diplomatic, and military, in his power, to execute the announced will of Congress, and, in defiance of its authority, should continue to prosecute the war for purposes and objects other than those declared by that body, it would become the right and duty of Congress to adopt the most efficacious measures to arrest the further progress of the war, taking care to make ample provision for the honor, the safety and security of our armies in Mexico, in every contingency. And, if Mexico should decline or refuse to conclude a treaty with us, stipulating for the purposes and objects so declared by Congress, it would be the duty of the Government to prosecute the war, with the utmost vigor, until they were attained by a treaty of peace.

"5. *Resolved*, That we view with serious alarm, and are utterly opposed to any purpose of annexing Mexico to the United States, in any mode, and especially by conquest; that we believe the two nations could not be happily governed by one common authority, owing to their great difference of race, law, language, and religion, and the vast extent of their respective territories, and large amount of their respective populations: that such a union, against the consent of the exasperated Mexican people, could only be effected and preserved by large standing armies, and the constant application of military force; in other words, by despotic sway, exercised over the Mexican people in the first instance, but which there would be just cause to appre-

hend, might in process of time be extended over the people of the United States. That we deprecate, therefore, such a union, as wholly incompatible with the genius of our Government, and with the character of free and liberal institutions; and we anxiously hope that each nation may be left in the undisturbed possession of its own laws, language, cherished religion, and territory, to pursue its own happiness according to what it may deem best for itself.

"6. *Resolved*, That considering the series of splendid and brilliant victories achieved by our brave armies and their gallant commanders, during the war with Mexico, unattended by a single reverse, the United States without any danger of their honor suffering the slightest tarnish, can practice the virtues of moderation and magnanimity toward their discomfited foe. We have no desire for the dismemberment by the United States of the republic of Mexico, but wish only a just and proper fixation of the limits of Texas.

"7. *Resolved*, That we do positively and emphatically disclaim and disavow any wish or desire on our part, to acquire any foreign territory whatever, for the purpose of propagating slavery, or of introducing slaves from the United States, into such foreign territory.

"8. *Resolved*, That we invite our fellow-citizens of the United States, who are anxious for the restoration of the blessings of peace, or, if the existing war shall continue to be prosecuted, are desirous that its purposes and objects shall be defined and known, who are anxious to avert present and future perils and dangers, with which it may be fraught, and who are also anxious to produce contentment and satisfaction at home, and to elevate the national character abroad, to assemble together in their respective communities and to express their views, feelings, and opinions."

In the extracts from the speech above given, there are, as will be seen, only four points of the general argument discussed, which are, first, the question of annexing Mexico; next, the impossibility of repairing, by direct means, great and complicated injustice that may have been perpetrated in the progress of human affairs, such as slavery; third, the warning derived from history, of the doom of conquerors and conquering nations; and fourth, the value of national reputation before the world. The reader must look to the resolutions submitted for all the points of argument considered by Mr. Clay on that occasion.

The first resolution, as we need not say, is an impeachment of the President of the United States, Mr. Polk, for the manner in which he precipitated the war, on his own responsibility,

without authority of Congress, which is the only constitutional power competent to make war. It was evidently the purpose of the Constitution that the national Executive should never have it in his power to involve the nation in war. But we find, as in this case, and in a multitude of hypothetical cases of international diplomacy, that the national Executive can easily subvert the Constitution, and bring on inevitable war. War is generally, though not always, the result of diplomacy. It is so easy to make a *casus belli* in the temper and mode of diplomacy, that the power of making war vested by the Constitution in Congress alone, seems to be an entire failure. Scarcely any dispute arises between our government and that of any foreign nation, in which it is not in the power of our national Executive to commit the nation to a war, and he may be tempted to do so from personal and party motives; such, for example, as his own election to a second or third term of office, and, it might be, for the perpetuation of his own power. Or it might result from the motives of diverting the public mind from a scrutiny of his own maladministration, by occupying it in foreign affairs, and in alleged grievances inflicted by a foreign power. We see by experience that cases are almost constantly occurring, in which the Federal Executive might involve the nation in war by diplomacy.

President Polk, apparently, was determined to precipitate the war with Mexico, when, as commander-in-chief of the army, he ordered General Taylor to march from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande; and such was the immediate effect. He then called on Congress to declare a war, which was in actual progress by his own sole instrumentality. He had foreseen that his own party in Congress and in the nation would sustain him; but the fact is undeniable that he himself, of his own will, commenced hostilities, by an order to the army, which involved the moral certainty of actual hostilities; and it was only by an eminent historical error incorporated in the declaration of war by Congress, to wit: that Mexico had commenced hostilities, that the transaction was glossed over, and the President rescued from impeachment before the Senate of the United States. In this way the war was began. It was a war made by the President of the United States, without authority of Congress, which demonstrates a grave defect in the Federal Constitution, or in its practical operation. It was the intention of the Constitution

that the President should never have it in his power to make war. But we see that he has this power, in more ways than one. Mr. Polk did it, in this instance, by an order from the War Department; and the President of the United States can do it at any time, in the management of our foreign relations through the State Department.

The second resolution discloses the singular fact that no objects of the war were declared by Congress, and that its sole conduct was left with the President, for such objects as might suit himself, in the same manner as he commenced hostilities. Late in the day as it was to declare the objects of the war, when Mexico was subdued, and lay at our feet, the purpose of this resolution was to suggest the propriety and importance of such a declaration, that the nation and government might understand their own aims, and pursue them, and that the President should no longer be permitted to carry on the war at his own discretion, as he had begun and hitherto conducted it.

The third and fourth resolutions were designed to show the constitutional ground on which the second was based, and to point out a constitutional course to check the arbitrary power of the President, and bring the war to a close.

The fifth resolution rebukes the popular and ambitious design, at that moment rife with a considerable portion of the American people, of annexing to the United States the whole of Mexico, and shows how disastrous such a consummation would prove to the people and government of the United States; and we doubt not that the publication of this resolution, and the argument on that point, which we have given above, had great influence on the public mind and on the government, in determining the terms of pacification finally adopted.

The sixth resolution appeals to the nation for a magnanimous treatment of a discomfited foe.

The seventh resolution is one of great significancy. In Mr. Clay's *Raleigh Letter*, on the proposed annexation of Texas, he said, in substance, that the object of extending the area of slavery was not to be disguised. To this Mr. Clay was, to his death, openly opposed, and he evidently regarded the Mexican war as having that object, with those who had precipitated it so unnecessarily, wantonly, and unconstitutionally. It was for this reason, doubtless, that he made this seventh resolution so distinct, pointed, and emphatic, in the repudiation of such a purpose.

The eighth and last resolution, calling for an expression of public opinion throughout the land, on the subject of these resolutions, was instantly responded to by public and imposing assemblies of the people in numerous quarters.

We will here cite only one of the numerous public declarations made, in answer to this call, by the American people, in the language of the address adopted at an immense meeting at the Tabernacle, New York, December 20th, 1847, only seven days after Mr. Clay's speech at Lexington—so quick did the pulse of the nation respond:

"The spirit now dominant in the national councils, and rampant throughout the land, not only mocks at gray hairs and tramples on the lessons of experience, but regards with impatience and ill-disguised contempt every appeal to considerations of morality, philanthropy, or religion, in regard to the prosecution or termination of the war. The fierce bay of the bloodhound on the warm track of his prey drowns the calm voice of reason and the soft pleadings of humanity. Who that realizes the moral accountability of nations can doubt that we have fallen upon evil days?

"In this crisis a voice from the west reaches the ear and fixes the regard of the American people. A venerable patriot, illustrious by forty years of eminent service in the national councils, emerges from his honored seclusion to address words of wise admonition to his fellow-citizens. That voice, which never counseled aught to dishonor or injure this Union, is lifted up, probably for the last time, in exposure of the specious pretexts on which this war was commenced, in reprehension of its character and objects, and its remonstrance against its further prosecution. At the sound of that impressive voice, the scales of delusion fall from thousands of flashing eyes, the false glitter of the conqueror's glory vanishes, revealing the hideous lineaments of carnage; and the stern question which stung the first murderer is brought home essentially to every breast which enfolds a conscience: 'Where is thy brother?' To what end do we despoil and slay our fellow-men guilty of being born two thousand miles south-west of us? By what Divine law are we authorized thus to deface and destroy the image of God?

"The great statesman of the West was too well acquainted with human nature, and had too much experience of its worst developments, to hope that such an appeal as he has made to the nation's moral sense would not be resented and resisted. He knew that exposed depravity would pour out its vials of wrath on his devoted head; that fell rapacity would neglect for a moment its prey to tear him with its fangs; and that malice

would stimulate calumny to hunt and defame him through the length and breadth of the land. Calmly he bared his breast to the storm; unflinchingly he contemplates its fiercest rage, its most dismal howlings. Shielded in the panoply of an approving conscience, and of the commendation of the wise and good throughout the world, he proffers no resistance, requires no sympathy, solicits no aid. For himself he desires nothing; for his imperiled country he demands the services and the sacrifices of all her upright and patriotic sons.

"And his appeal has not been fruitless. On every side the people, aroused as by a trumpet-blast, are awaking to a consciousness of their duty. No longer sunk in apathy because they can perceive no mode in which exertion can avail, they realize at last that every honorable means should be employed to arrest the work of carnage; and they feel that, in view of the brilliant achievements of our armies, and the utter prostration of their foes, the honor of our country can best be preserved and exalted by the exercise of magnanimity toward the vanquished. The means of terminating the war have been clearly pointed out by him who is emphatically first in the affections and in the confidence of the American people, HENRY CLAY; and it needs but that their representatives shall be faithful as he has been fearless, to insure a speedy restoration of peace."

At another meeting, subsequently held at Castle Garden, said to be the largest ever gathered in this country under one roof, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we regard the late speech of Mr. Clay, at Lexington, in exposure of the causes, character and objects, of the present war in Mexico, as among the noblest and most patriotic efforts of the great and true man, 'who would rather be right than be President.'"

It is worthy of remark that Mr. Clay's Lexington speech on the Mexican war, was printed in New York in gold letters, and bound in elegant octavo, with blank interleaves, with a frontispiece exhibiting a full length portrait of Mr. Clay, in the act of speaking, standing on a rock, with the American flag on his right, in the hand of a sailor; an artisan on his left, in a listening attitude, and surrounded with emblems of peace and war. It is still held by those who were so fortunate as to obtain copies of it, as a precious memento of the occasion.

In the winter of 1847–8, Mr. Clay was found at Washington, on professional business, in the Supreme Court of the United

States, and was present, in January, at the annual meeting of the American Colonization Society, of which he was one of the founders, and had long been its President. It was equally as a matter of public policy, as of a humane and Christian enterprise, that Mr. Clay was an original, and had continued a constant advocate of this Society. As a statesman, he saw it must be for the good of the country; and as a philanthropist, he adopted and espoused its cause, for the good of the African race. Time has contributed only to verify the correctness of his views, and to establish the validity of his opinion. For a long period, that Society has had to encounter the opposition of narrow-minded and professed Christian philanthropists, who were incapable of estimating that vast circle and mighty career of Providence, which is preparing the way to redeem Africa from barbarism and paganism, by the very wrongs which have been done to her sons in making them slaves on the American continent. This is not an age in which to vindicate the slave-trade, or to justify slavery. There is no need of argument on the subject. The only question is, as to the best, most wholesome, and most effective remedy for the mighty evils which the slave-trade and slavery have brought on human society. The one-idea remedy is, to break down society for the sake of breaking down slavery. There never was a reform, composed of one idea, which did not tend to mischief. Slavery in the United States is, in fact, an institution ramified in society, and so interwoven with its structure that an attempt to pluck it from the fabric by violence, if successful, would bring the whole fabric to the ground. But a Christian statesman, like Mr. Clay—for he always had the views of a Christian on this, if not on all subjects—takes a wider view. In the first place, society must be maintained as "the ordinance of God." In the next place, the evils of society can only be eradicated by gradual reform. These are fundamental maxims with the Christian statesman.

Here is the great fact of African slavery incorporated with American society; and here is a corresponding truth, that neither the present generation of Americans, nor the American government, is responsible for its introduction. They are only responsible for its treatment, and for its ultimate disposal. And here is another great fact, that the African race has been greatly improved by their transfer to this continent, even in a condition of slavery. That is a providential result, and not an apology for

slavery. No other race on earth has improved so much in an equal period. All this is providential, and can not be pleaded in mitigation of the crime of the slave-trade. But if, by this means, the race have been, and are being fitted, qualified, to return and redeem their fatherland, the continent of Africa, from barbarism and paganism, and from the slave traffic forever, it may well be looked upon as a part of that great circle of Providence which has ever been characterized as competent, and as being ordered, to bring good out of evil. This would seem to be the position which the American Colonization Society now occupies, as the instrument of Providence, in carrying back to Africa the descendants of her children, thus providentially qualified for the great design of repairing the wrongs done to her by ages and centuries of the slave-trade. When the opposition to this Society, which has embarrassed its operations for many years, shall have died away—and it is rapidly subsiding now—there is much reason to hope that the current of emigration from the United States to Liberia will be like the present movement of the population of Europe to America ; and there is good reason for believing that, from precisely the same motives, to wit, freedom and equality, the former movement may be equal to the latter.

"Why, gentlemen," said Mr. Clay, in his address as President of the Society, in January 1848, "if I am not mistaken, there comes yearly into the single port of New York, an immigration amounting almost [much more now] to the actual increase of the population in that city, and perhaps exceeding the annual increase of all the free people of color in the United States. And this is done voluntarily, upon the great motives of human action. Thus the German and Irish immigrate in flocks to our shores annually, with no considerable aid on the part of their governments, and with no private aid, in numbers equal, perhaps, to the annual increase of all the Africans in the United States, bond and free. These all come to our country in obedience to one of the laws of our nature—in pursuance of the great controlling principle of human action, and which enters into all great enterprises. They come here to better their condition. And so it would be with all our free people of color. Were they to be transported from the United States to Africa, would not their condition be physically, morally, socially, and politically better and happier than any thing which they could attain to or hope for here? It is vain to attempt to eradicate the feeling which

keeps asunder these two races. It is vain for the office of philosophy or humanity to attempt what is so utterly impracticable as joining together those whom God himself, by the difference of color, and various other distinctions, has declared ought to be separate. Then, to send them to Africa, not by coercion, but with their own full consent, let me say to Abolitionists, and to those on the other extreme—to all men—why should not the free colored race, residing among us, have the option to go to Africa, or remain in the United States?"

Beyond question, African Colonization of free colored people of the United States is one of the great movements of the time —more properly, perhaps, the incipient stage of one of the grand movements of the future. The most obvious feature of the moral certainty of its success is the general sympathy of mankind in the fortunes of the African race. What but this feeling has made Uncle Tom's Cabin fall upon the bosom of the world with such unexampled acceptance? Throughout the Christian world, men will listen with eagerness to a reasonable, practicable proposal for the redemption of Africa; and what other gleam of light, what gleam so bright, tending thitherward, has ever dawned upon the world, as the erection and recognized independence of the Republic of Liberia? Those men in the United States, and in England too, who have stood in the way of this enterprise, who have checked for a while its onward career, by their unreasonable, wicked opposition, would have a fearful account to render to the Great Arbiter of the cause of humanity, if, as a body, they could be arraigned in judgment before His tribunal on this specification. They have put back the cause for an age, or for ages. But the true character of their opposition is now being exposed, and the Colonization movement is beginning to feel the effect of the candid judgment of mankind. There is no other light for the African race, and like the morning sun in the East, with a splendor not less cheering, and with a march not less secure of coming to high noon, it may henceforth move on its way rejoicing.

"I would now implore all parties," said Mr. Clay, in the conclusion of his address on this occasion, "I would beseech the Abolitionists, and I would beseech all those who hold the doctrines of the opposite extreme, insisting upon the institution of slavery —I would beseech all men to look calmly and dispassionately at this great project which commends itself to their friendly con-

sideration: I would beseech them to discard their prejudices, and ask them in the name of that God, under whose smiling providence I verily believe this society has thus far been conducted, and will in future continue—to look and contemplate for a moment this experiment of twenty-five years' continuance, which, without power, without revenue, without any aid except what has been furnished by the charity of man, has carried on a war—not aggressive, but a defensive war—and transported to Africa between five and six thousand emigrants from the United States. I would ask you to look at the territory which we have acquired: three hundred and twenty [now five hundred] miles of coast on the west of Africa, and in every part of which the slave-trade has been suppressed."

Mr. Clay showed clearly, as history abundantly attests, that the early settlements of the American colonies, now the United States, had even more difficulties to contend with. The ravages of disease at Jamestown, Va., on the first settlers, were greater than those which have been experienced at Liberia; and the first struggles of the Plymouth colonists were only equaled by their virtue in sustaining them. And what have these settlements now come to? Let the position which the United States of North America now occupy in the list of nations; let the grandeur of our institutions, our internal thrift, the magnitude and extent of our commerce, our cities, our States, our extended and vast domain, stretching from ocean to ocean, and from the frosty regions of the North to the torrid climes of the South, and our twenty-five millions of people, answer. Let our influence and power among the nations of the earth, answer. And who shall say that Africa, in two or three centuries to come, will not present to the world a picture like this, all in consequence of the enterprise of the American Colonization Society? The original elements are the same in both cases, the motives of action are the same, and the favor of the world toward the African race is greater, far greater than that experienced by the first settlers of America. Long time has the story of Africa's wrongs been written on the heart of all Christendom, and never will the nations of Christendom cease to help on with Africa's redemption. There is no jealousy, never can be; it is all sympathy. The Africans are a different race from the Europeans and Anglo-Saxons. The two can never amalgamate together, and will never desire it. The white races being superior in all their develop-

ments, physical, moral, social, and political, hitherto, can never be jealous of Africans; and the prevalence of Christian brotherhood, which characterizes the age, and which is growing on the world, will second all measures for the improvement and advancement of the African race.

"On, then, gentlemen," said Mr. Clay; "go on, in the name of the cause. I shall soon leave you and this theater of action forever. But I trust that the spirit which led to the formation of this Society, will survive me, and that, in other hands and under other auspices, this Colonization Society of ours may be still found asserting its sufficiency, in co-operation with the Republic of Liberia, to transport to that region every free person of color who may be disposed to go there, until, I trust, the separation of the two races shall be at last completed, and other generations shall have sprung up to invoke—as in closing I now do—upon the noble cause of Colonization, the blessings of that God whose smile, I think, has been hitherto extended to it."

And so the patriot bade farewell forever to the Society, over which he had so long presided with his accustomed dignity and grace, which was so long cherished by him, as one of the noblest philanthropic institutions of the age, not less promising in his esteem of auspicious influence on the country than to the African race. That this Society should have had the favor of such a man as Mr. Clay at its organization, that it should have realized his constant aid and support in its whole career, and received his blessing as he was retiring from the scenes of public life and from the world, cannot fail to be regarded as evidences of no ordinary character, of its high claims to the respect of mankind.

This meeting of the Society was held in the hall of the House of Representatives, which was crowded to overflowing on the occasion, as it was known that Mr. Clay would preside, and deliver an address, a few extracts from which are given above. He apologized for his want of preparation, as he had not been able to make a single note to guide him in his remarks. But on that theme, as on all others of a public nature, Mr. Clay was always at home, and *semper paratus*. His memory was sufficiently well stored with facts, his heart was in the cause, and his tongue was ever ready for the expression of his feelings. The impression made by his address was great, and will be enduring.

The next appearance of Mr. Clay at Washington, this winter

which attracted general attention, was in the Supreme Court, on the 11th of February, as one of the counsel in the case of William Houston *versus* the City Bank of New Orleans. The Hon. John Sargent, of Philadelphia, was of the opposing counsel. The court-room was of course densely packed with a crowd of admiring auditors. "At an early hour," says a correspondent, "the avenues leading to the Capitol were thronged with crowds of the aged and young, the beautiful and gay, all anxious to hear—perhaps for the last time—the voice of the sage of Ashland. On no former occasion was the Supreme Court so densely packed—every inch of space was occupied, even to the lobbies leading to the Senate. Mr. Clay rose a few minutes after eleven o'clock, the hour at which the court is organized. It has been often said, and truly, that he never was and never could be reported successfully. His magic manner, the captivating tones of his voice, and a natural grace, singular in its influence and peculiarly his own, can never be transferred to paper. To realize their charms, he must be seen and heard." His exordium as he rose to address the court, has been represented as not less touching than beautiful. Mr. Clay's recollections and sentiments were always in harmony, and no man could better grace facts with touches of feeling. As this might be the last time he would ever appear in that place, what more natural than that he should make some allusion to the first? He did so with great pertinency and effect, and as he was a model of suavity and politeness, it was equally natural that he should pay a compliment to the court, which, indeed, in its moral influence, was not likely to injure his client; though, far be it from us to suggest that the court could be unduly influenced. Not a face was on that bench which was to be seen in that place when Mr. Clay first had the honor of appearing as counsel there; that was a monition of the changing scenes of life. But the court had maintained its character and dignity. That was a compliment. After a few such like historical allusions, and touches of sentiment, done in Mr. Clay's peculiar style of pertinency, grace, and dignity, to the edification of the court, as well as to the delight of his audience, he proceeded to open his case. His argument on this occasion was allowed to be as vigorous and as effective as any he ever made.

An incident in this case, and its story, are perhaps worthy of record. Mr. Sargent complained of haste in the counsel for the plaintiff, to which Mr. Clay replied :—

"I happened some years ago, in the performance of a public service, to be abroad in England, and I occasionally attended both Houses of Parliament and the courts of Westminster Hall. * * * * * The speakers in Parliament would begin with their subject, and end when their subject was exhausted. In the courts of Westminster, I was impressed still more with the economy of the dispatch of business. * * * After the tipstaff had pronounced the introductory, 'God save the King,' his lordship asked the oldest *Sergeant*, 'Have you any motion to make?' 'Yes, please your lordship, I have a case in which I wish to establish this point,' naming it. 'You can not maintain that,' said his lordship. 'But,' said the *Sergeant*, 'I only wish to quote a few authorities.' 'It is of no use,' said his lordship, 'the proposition can not be maintained;' and the same observation was echoed along the line of judges, and the case was dismissed in less time than it takes me to describe the incident."

At the same time, Mr. Clay alluded to a "*certain tradition*" regarding the length of a *Philadelphia lawyer's* speech. Of course, this was all in the best of humor, and Mr. Sargent smiled, as well as the judges on the bench. The incident of a *Sergeant* in the English court, and the "tradition" about the long speeches of Philadelphia lawyers, were too tempting, the one for sound and the other for pertinency, not to be applied by Mr. Clay on such a provocation, to the great amusement of all present.

Mr. Clay always delighted to sport in the sunny side of all thoughts, and to make all sides of thought sunny. "Madam," said Mr. Clay to Mrs. Polk, when dining one day this winter with the President, "I have never heard any body make the least complaint of *your* administration, though I have occasionally heard *some* complaint of your husband's."

On the 22d of February of this year (1848), the Hon. John Quincy Adams, then in his eighty-first year, was stricken down by paralysis in his seat in the House of Representatives, and carried insensible to the Speaker's room, never more to return to his functions as a public man. It is somewhat remarkable that the day which brought so bright and glorious a star—sun, we might say—into the American firmament as George Washington, should be the day of the setting glory of John Quincy Adams. It was his desire, his fervent prayer, to die in the service of his country; and he fell with his harness on. From the seat of earthly legislation, he was borne to an adjoining apartment of the

Capitol of the nation, there to linger on death's threshold a few hours, and then pass to the judgment-bar of the Maker of us all. His last words were, "This is the last of earth—I am content."

Mr. Clay was then in Washington, and about to leave for the North. Though Mr. Adams lived but fifty hours after he was carried to the Speaker's room, he might continue many days, as then supposed. Mr. Clay, of course, could not depart without visiting the dying bed of his compatriot—his old associate in affairs of state at home and abroad. Sitting by his side, Mr. Adams unconscious of his presence, Mr. Clay took his hand in one of his, covered his own face with the other, and gave vent, as he could not but do from the sympathies of his own nature, to the silent workings of his grief. Long had they toiled in the same field, in a common cause, for a common country; and here they met, to part forever on this side the grave—already parted indeed, for the dying man was not aware of the presence of his friend. Communion of thought and of sentiment was at an end. Mr. Clay wept. We know not his thoughts: they may in part be imagined by his momentary glance of the past in which they were both personally and so much concerned, and by his realization of the present. "This is the last of earth;" the last to him who lay there unconscious, though not the last to the other party, whom sturdy and unknown conflicts still awaited. Mr. Clay retired from the scene, without being able to say, other than in the silent language of his heart, "Adieu, my friend! As thou hast said, to thee '*this is the last of earth!*'"

Regarding the subject entitled, "*The Great Conspiracy*," in the first volume of this work, Mr. Adams, in a speech delivered at Maysville, Ky., 1843, said: "As I expect shortly to appear before my God, to answer for the conduct of my whole life, should those charges have found their way to the throne of Eternal Justice, I will, in the presence of Omnipotence, pronounce them false." This, as will be seen, partakes of the nature of a solemn oath—the oath of a man of unquestioned conscientiousness—made before the public on earth, and challenged to be recorded in heaven, to be reviewed and answered there, at the last great day. And such an oath may at least be regarded as "the end of all strife."

When the author of these pages returned from Kentucky, in the spring of 1845, after having spent the winter in connection with Mr. Clay, for the purpose of access to his papers, and to

obtain information from his own lips regarding his life and times, he called on Mr. Adams, at his house in Washington, for information on certain points of history, which Mr. Adams could best give. Mr. A., aware of the purpose of the author, very frankly alluded to the controversy, once had between himself and Mr. Clay, regarding the transactions of the treaty of Ghent, and paused a little in the conversation, apparently to hear how the author proposed to treat that subject. It was known that the public, to some extent, had for a long time imagined that there was some unsettled difference between Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams, and that some revelations were yet to be made by one party or the other. The author, with the same frankness which characterized Mr. Adams's remarks, said to him, in substance, that in his frequent and numerous interviews with Mr. Clay during the winter, conversation, for the objects in view, necessarily included occasionally the former relations of Mr. Clay and Mr. Adams; and that he, the author, had never heard Mr. Clay speak of Mr. Adams other than in terms of the most unqualified respect and friendship; in short, except as instructed by the documents once made public, he (the author) never would have imagined there had been any difference between them. Mr. Adams was evidently gratified with this assurance, and took occasion to remark that, so far as he knew, there was not the slightest ground for the impression which some people had, that there was any thing new of an unpleasant kind between himself and Mr. Clay, to be disclosed.

Thus we see how Mr. Clay, with all his characteristic sincerity and sympathy, and with feelings of the profoundest sorrow, could sit by the dying bed of Mr. Adams, take his hand, and weep over the fall of a great and good man, whose faults, if he had them, were not remembered: and whose virtues and public services were chronicled in ineffaceable characters on the tablet of Mr. Clay's heart. Mr. Clay was a true and Christian mourner over the grave of his friend.

Mr. Clay, having professional engagements at Philadelphia, was forced to leave Washington, not knowing how soon he would hear of the death of Mr. Adams. There was no hope of his recovery, but the physician said he might live a week or more. But intelligence of his decease overtook Mr. Clay at Baltimore, and naturally spread a gloom over his mind in the midst of the acclaim with which he was received. One great

statesman had just gone up for judgment to his God; another stood before the people as arbiters of the destiny which yet awaited him on earth; for Mr. Clay was still a candidate for the Presidency among those who were attached to his person and to his principles. He had never solicited or declined the popular summons. As the time appointed, the 7th of May, for both of the great political parties of the country to make their nominations to this high office, was near at hand, the feelings of the people had begun to kindle for the strife. Wherever Mr. Clay appeared, it was a signal for the uprising and outpouring of the people in favor of his election. Not even the pall of death which hung over the national Capitol could repress their ardor, and Mr. Clay was forced to present himself, on his arrival in Baltimore, at the window of his host, Mr. Christopher Hughes, formerly secretary of the American mission at Ghent. After an interchange of salutations, however, Mr. Clay retired, and left for Philadelphia the next morning.

At a public reception of Mr. Clay, in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, he very pertinently said: "But for the loss which the country had just sustained in the decease of Mr. Adams, this would have been one of the happiest occasions of his life. As it was, the loss of the purest of patriots, and best of men, had caused a sensation of grief to pervade the whole country; and how much greater than those of others, must be the feelings of one, who had been closely connected with him in both public and private life; who had ever found him, at all times, and under all circumstances, the pure and elevated patriot, the tried, the faithful friend, the wise and good man. The loss was heavy to all; but to none more so than to the speaker. His heart was so surcharged with emotions natural to such an event, that he must be excused from the formalities of a speech."

It will be remembered that Mr. Clay declined an invitation to New York, brought to him at Cape May by a delegation from that city, in August of the preceding year. But a still more imposing solicitation was conveyed to him at this time from the Mayor and Common Council of New York, to visit that city as their guest before his return to the West, which he could not well decline without disrespect to those who had done him this honor. He accordingly went to New York on the 7th of March, 1848, accompanied by a committee from Philadelphia as far as Amboy, where he was received by a committee from the New

York Board of Aldermen, and landed at Castle Garden, amidst the enthusiastic cheers of the people, and formally welcomed by the Mayor, as the city's guest. The Mayor spoke as follows:—

"MR. CLAY: The pleasing duty has been assigned to me, as the representative of the constituted authorities of New York, to tender to you its hospitalities, and its cordial welcome. It is not necessary for me—indeed, sir, it would not become me—to advert to your many and valued public services. The whole country gratefully acknowledges the zeal, the devotion, with which a whole life has been passed in upholding her interests, in defending her honor, in augmenting her prosperity; and we, sir, citizens of the great commercial metropolis of this Western world, rejoice that we are permitted to testify to you personally our appreciation of the worth, the talents, the statesmanship, and the pure patriotism, which have combined to surround, with a halo of imperishable glory, the name of HENRY CLAY. * * We receive you, sir, as the honored, the cherished guest of this great city."

To which Mr. Clay replied:—

"MR. MAYOR: I wish I could find adequate language to express to you and to this audience, the feelings of a grateful heart, excited by this splendid and magnificent reception. * * * My arrival here to-day has been signalized by the discharge of cannon, by the display of flags, by the sound of gay and exulting music, by the shouts and cheers of an affectionate multitude, directed toward myself. I am proud and thankful for these evidences of regard and of appreciation, for the humble services of an individual whom you esteem far too highly. But, sir, these testimonies offered to the living could not fail to remind me of the just honors about to be paid to the dead. To-morrow's sun will rise upon another and a different spectacle than that which it to-day beholds, as the venerable remains of the illustrious ex-President of the United States reach this city. Then, instead of the cheers of joy and gladness which have been uttered upon this occasion, there will be the still expression of solemn and of saddened feeling. As I contemplate the scene which will be presented on that anticipated arrival, as I recollect the signal services and glorious career of the great departed, and the sphere to which he now has passed—a state of being that awaits us all,—I am moved to suppress the feelings of grateful joy, which would otherwise overflow within me, on an occasion so honorable to myself. Ought not the contrast between this day's demonstrations, on the arrival of an humble individual, whose efforts in his country's service you much too highly appreciate, and the

ceremonies which will follow to-morrow, to make a deep impression on our minds? Ought they not, for the few days remaining to us, to moderate the unworthy impulses which most men bring into the strifes of our existence here—to repress and chasten the violence of party contests, and the heat and acrimony of party feeling, for the brief space which intervenes between the present moment and that near at hand, when we shall all be laid low in the narrow house which our venerable and pure-hearted patriot now occupies? * * * And now, sir, will you permit me to thank yourself and the public authorities of the people of this city, for this splendid reception, and for the kindness and liberal hospitality which you have authorized me to expect at your hands."

After the reception, a civic procession was formed, and moved up Broadway, amid the cheers of the tens of thousands crowding the streets and filling the windows and every place of observation. On the following day, as depicted in Mr. Clay's speech above, the mortal remains of Mr. Adams were received at the same place, and borne along the same way, to their final resting-place, in Quincy, Massachusetts. Thus succeed each other the joyful and the sad, the exultations and funereal signs of man's earthly career. One is honored in his chariot of victory, another in his coffin.

The chastened feelings of Mr. Clay, as evinced in his speeches, both at Philadelphia and New York, extracts and abbreviations of which are given above, expecting, as he did, to be followed so soon by the remains of his ancient friend and fellow-laborer in the field of public service, are honorable to his heart, and demonstrate that, while he was not ungrateful for the pageants enacted in compliment to himself, he was yet more impressed with those impending pageants which signalize the triumphs of the King of Terrors. While his steps were seemingly tottering on the brink of Death's domain, himself followed and cheered by the acclamations of the multitude, he was bending over and looking into that world which, he was quite aware, so nearly awaited himself. Always influenced more or less by religious sentiment, he now felt and acted as a Christian man. He had publicly honored the Saviour of mankind, by bowing his head to the baptism of the Cross, and by subscribing his name as a member of that family whose inheritance comes in reversion, after the battles of life are ended.

The solemnities of Mr. Adams's funeral at New York being

over, and his remains borne onward to the tomb of his father, built and inscribed by his own hands, Mr. Clay received the honors of the city, in various forms, from day to day, by being presented to the citizens at the City Hall—or rather by shaking hands with them, for he was too well known to require being presented; by being accompanied to some of the various and most eminent public institutions, and attractive objects and improvements of this proud and ever-expanding and rising metropolis. It was his last social entertainment here. The next time he visited New York, and the last in which public honors could be rendered to him present, he lay still and unconscious in the arms of death, and was borne along, like his predecessor, Mr Adams, to his final home. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*

But, in this stage of our history, Mr. Clay is still a living, sentient, active being; still the idol of his countrymen; still looked up to as a candidate for public trust and honors, though about to step into his seventy-second year, on the twelfth day of the next succeeding month; himself, in some measure, tottering on the brink of the grave. But he was a man of iron, still walking erect, evincing all his wonted powers of intellect and correctness of judgment, and as well qualified as ever for public affairs. The wisdom and maturity of his experience were, perhaps, even more reliable than in former years.

Such a man, so long tried, so true, so faithful to his country, and so well versed in its affairs; a man who, by the very openness and trustfulness of his nature, had suffered one of the greatest wrongs recorded in history, as developed in the fourteenth chapter of the first volume of this work, stamping with eternal infamy the conspirators in that transaction; a man who had been three times* before the people as nominee for the Presidency, abused and hunted down by calumny to his defeat; who should have been nominated in 1840, and, as no one doubts, would necessarily have been elected by a like overwhelming majority, as that which then carried in the Whig nominee so triumphantly (for the country was prepared for it, and great is the responsibility of those who stood in the way of that nomination); who failed of his election in 1844, only by that unfairness which

* The scrub-race of 1826 is not worthy of mention in this list of three times; and in the campaign of 1832, the anti-Jackson strength was divided by anti-masonry, a numerous party at that time; so that Mr. Clay was never fairly before the people till 1844; when, as shown elsewhere, he was beaten by fraud.

ever characterized his opponents, as shown in the eighteenth chapter of the second volume; and who, in 1848, was still stronger in public favor than ever before. The enthusiasm of the Irish population of the country in his behalf, for his speech at New Orleans, that proved so effective for the relief of their famishing brethren at home, as certified by a correspondence heretofore cited, was alone sufficient to have turned the scale for Mr. Clay's triumphant election in 1848. That, like all of Mr. Clay's strongholds on the affections of the American people, was a legitimate advantage. It was purchased by pleading the cause of humanity; and human nature never fails to respond generously to such efforts.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FALL OF THE WHIG PARTY.

History of the Apostasy of the Whig Party from Whig Principles.—The Injustice to Mr. Clay in the Nomination of General Harrison and of General Taylor.—Mr. Clay a sacrificial Victim.—The overthrow of the Whig Party.—Mr. Clay's spotless Reputation and Fame.

That a party of principle, which had so long followed in the wake of Mr. Clay's advocacy of principle, should have been shaken in its columns, and wavered, and been so far broken, in 1840, as to desert their great chieftain, and fall back on the Jackson principle of belief in military fame, without having a Jackson to lead, was a strong symptom of the future discomfitures that awaited them. For they seem to have hoped that General Harrison, with his military feather, would supply his lack of Mr. Clay's character as a statesman. For it is no disparagement to General Harrison to say that the distance between him and Mr. Clay, in this particular, was immense. And yet the Whig party preferred General Harrison to Mr. Clay! And they made this choice at the time when they were most secure of Mr. Clay, if they had put him in nomination, and when they most needed him. As if Providence must ever frown on the want of fidelity to principle, General Harrison died in thirty days after his inauguration, and Mr. Tyler, who, by the Constitution, succeeded to the functions of President, betrayed the party, and it was disorganized, so far as not to be able to carry out its policy or maintain its ground against a hostile Executive. With broken columns, still recognizing Mr. Clay as a leader, it hobbled on through two administrations, to make another great trial of strength in 1848, with the party of no principle—or which at the beginning had no principle; but which, by this time, however, was able to construct a Baltimore platform.

Another military feather was waving in the eye of the Whig party in 1848. It was won at the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, at the siege and capture of Montery, and at Buena Vista. It was hard to shatter the great principles of the Whig party. But there were those in it who had grown gray in waiting for office under the banner of Mr. Clay, and whose memories were refreshed with what was effected by the éclat of military glory under General Jackson. It was hard, and might seem ungrateful, to abandon a great and long-tried leader. But the military feather waved before their eyes, and they were tempted. They did not know what correspondence had taken place between Mr. Clay and General Taylor; if they had known it, perhaps they would have acted differently; and Mr. Clay was too noble to tell them.

It needed a leader, or a few leaders to give the signal of defection; and they were not wanting. One after another of the great names of the party fell off from Mr. Clay and inclined to General Taylor; and when the national Whig Convention met at Philadelphia, in June, 1848, to nominate a candidate for the Presidency, the first ballot showed that seven out of twelve of the Kentucky delegation, against the expectations and wishes of their constituency, had deserted Mr. Clay, and gone over to General Taylor. The influence of this fact was great—perhaps decisive. For if Mr. Clay's own State was against him, what could be expected of the other States? On the fourth ballot General Taylor had fifty-two majority, and was declared the nominee.

The following are the four ballots for the different candidates, with the result:

First Ballot.—Taylor, 111—Clay, 97—Scott, 43—Webster, 22—Clayton, 4—M'Lean, 2. Total, 279. No choice.

Second Ballot.—Taylor, 118—Clay, 86—Scott, 49—Webster, 22—Clayton, 4—No choice again. Adjourned to next morning.

Third Ballot.—Taylor, 133—Clay, 74—Scott, 54—Webster, 17—Clayton, 1.

Fourth Ballot.—Taylor, 171—Clay, 32—Scott, 63—Webster, 14. Taylor over all, 52.

In November following, General Taylor was elected President of the United States, and Millard Fillmore Vice-President. As in the case of General Harrison, who died in thirty days after

his inauguration, so in the case of General Taylor, another rebuke of Providence came upon the Whig party; and he, too, died in sixteen months after he had entered on the duties of his office. Mr. Fillmore's discharge of the Executive functions was always unexceptionable; but the Whig party was disorganized. They had not only deserted their great leader, who had stood by them under every cloud, and in every instance of adversity, but they had deserted their principles—not entirely, nor even nominally—but they had been tempted by military renown, and adopted it as a leading principle. From that moment they fell from a lofty height to the level of their opponents at the beginning of their career, and by this time, 1856, they are utterly disbanded. Their very name is extinct, and there is no such party. Mr. Clay foresaw it, feared it, and predicted it, as we shall see.

Mr. Clay nobly supported General Harrison when he was nominated, although he could not but be sensible of the ingratitude of the Whig party in such a preference. But when General Taylor was nominated, Mr. Clay was silent. He was earnestly solicited to come out in favor of General Taylor. He was still silent. There was a secret, known to himself, but concealed from the public. That secret is now revealed in General Taylor's letter of April 30, 1848, to Mr. Clay;* and in Mr. Clay's letter, June 26, 1848,† to the Committee of Louisville. General Taylor, in the letter above referred to, says:

"I conceive I am placed in rather a peculiar situation as regards my being a candidate for the Presidency. * * * I received the proceedings of the people, called together in primary assemblies in several of the States, nominating me as candidate for the Presidency at the next election, * * * and urging me to continue as a candidate, under all circumstances, on the grounds I had taken, which was not to be the exclusive candidate of any party; and, on reaching New Orleans, many friends called on me to let it be publicly announced, that my name, as a candidate for the office in question, would not be withdrawn, let who would be in the field, which I consented to, and advised my friends in Washington of my change in that respect, without delay. I therefore now conceive myself in the hands of the people, for the highest office in their gift."

Mr. Clay, in his letter to the Louisville Committee, says:

* Page 557, Private Correspondence.

† Page 566, Ibid.

"I have been much importuned from various quarters to endorse General Taylor as a good Whig, who will, if elected, act on Whig principles, and carry out Whig measures. But how can I do that? Can I say that in his hands Whig measures will be safe and secure, when he refuses to pledge himself to their support? when some of his most active friends say they are obsolete? when he is presented as a No-party candidate? when the Whig Convention at Philadelphia refused to recognize or proclaim its attachment to any principles or measures, and actually laid on the table resolutions having that object in view?

"Ought I to come out as a warm and partisan supporter of a candidate, who, in a reversal of our conditions, announced his purpose to remain as a candidate, and consequently to oppose me, so far as it depended upon himself? Tell me what reciprocity is in this? Magnanimity is a noble virtue, and I have always endeavored to practice it; but it has its limits, and the line of demarcation between it and meanness is not always clearly discernible. I have been reminded of the course I pursued in the case of the nomination of General Harrison, in 1839. But General Harrison was not merely a Whig in name; he was committed and pledged to the support of the measures of the Whigs. He did not declare that he would stand as a candidate in opposition to the nominee of the Convention. He was, moreover, a civilian of varied and extensive experience.

"I lost the nomination, as I firmly believe, by the conduct of the majorities of the delegations from Kentucky in Congress and in the Convention, and I am called upon to ratify what they did, in contravention, as I also believe, of the wishes of a large majority of the people of Kentucky! I am asked to sanction and approve the course of the seven delegates from Kentucky, who, in violation of the desire of their constituents, voted against me, and virtually to censure and condemn the five who voted for me."

In a letter to James Harlan, Esq., August 5, 1848,* Mr. Cla. says:

"It is mortifying to behold that once great party [the Whig party] descending from its lofty position of principle, known, avowed, and proclaimed principle, and lending itself to the creation of a mere personal party, with a virtual abandonment of its old principles."

Also, in a letter to Henry White, Esq., September 10, 1848,† Mr. Clay says:

* Page 571, Private Correspondence. † Page 573, Private Correspondence.

"Although I believe that the Philadelphia Convention has placed the Whig party in a humiliating condition—one which, I fear, will impair its usefulness, if not destroy its existence—I acquiesced in its decision in not nominating me, and have submitted quietly to it. I have done nothing to oppose its nomination. I have given no countenance to any movements having for this object any further use of my name, in connection with the office of President. Beyond this I can not go. Self-respect and consistency, with deliberate opinions long since formed, against the elevation to that office of a mere military man, must restrain me from taking any active part in the canvass."

During the pendency of the Presidential canvass of 1848, it was not known to the public that General Taylor had written to Mr. Clay to say, "let who will be in the field," I shall be there; and that he had consented to be a candidate, whoever might be nominated by the Convention, even against Mr. Clay. It is true, General Taylor had graciously said to Mr. Clay, in this letter, "Should you receive the nomination of the Whig National Convention, which is to meet in Philadelphia in June, and be elected in November [against me], but few of your friends will be more gratified than myself. And should you be unsuccessful, and should it be thought your being a candidate had the effect of preventing my election, it will not produce the slightest feeling of unkindness [in me] toward you." But the General intended to run, "let who would be in the field."

If Mr. Clay had not had too much magnanimity to make this announcement himself public, before the meeting of the Convention at Philadelphia took place, as most persons in the same circumstances would have done, there is no doubt who would have been the nominee. With such a disclosure, General Taylor's name would not have been admitted into the Convention. Or if the secret had come out during the canvass, it would have prevented the election of the Whig nominee. Mr. Clay was obliged to disclose it in confidence to the Louisville Committee, in self vindication. But he knew very well that they would not commit such a suicidal act on the party, in whose behalf they had written to him, as to publish it; and it never was published, till it appeared in "the Private Correspondence of Henry Clay," three years after Mr. Clay's death, when the truth and full exposition of history demanded its publication. Mr. Clay's silence and magnanimity in this matter, while he himself was suffering grievously, on account of this silence, under the reproaches of his

former friends, are only characteristic of himself. He was not only rejected in the Convention, but he was abused for not loaning his sanction to their actions, and for not taking the stump in behalf of their nominee. He might well say, as in his letter to the Committee, "What reciprocity is there in this? Magnanimity is a noble virtue, and I have always endeavored to practice it; but it has its limits, and the line of demarcation between it and meanness is not always clearly discernible."

If Mr. Clay had let out this secret before the meeting of the Convention—as he was justly entitled to do, and as almost any other man would have done, in the same circumstances—he would have been the nominee, and there would have been three candidates in the field, Mr. Clay, General Taylor, and General Cass, neither of whom would, in any probability, have obtained a majority of the popular vote, and consequently the election of President would have been transferred to the House of Representatives, where Mr. Clay's strength would doubtless have been greater than that of General Taylor, and the election would have fallen on Mr. Clay or General Cass. For it is not to be supposed that General Taylor, under these disclosures, and after time for consideration, would have occupied such ground, and had such chances in the House of Representatives, as he occupied and had before the people, when these facts were unknown, and when Mr. Clay was not in the field. Besides, the House of Representatives would have seen the difference in the qualifications of the two candidates for the office of President, and the utter absurdity of giving the preference to a mere military man when such a statesman as Mr. Clay was before them as an alternative choice. It is also to be considered that it was the simplest and easiest thing in the world for Mr. Clay, during the canvass, with such a power in his hands, to have thrust General Taylor into the background, and to have defeated his election. But he had never done, and would not now do any thing, which a malicious opponent could pervert, and turn to an impeachment of that elevated, and self-sacrificing, disinterested character, which he had so dearly won, in his long protracted career. And again he bowed his head as a sacrificial victim on the altar of his country.

So late in the canvass as about the first of September, General Taylor accepted a nomination made at Charleston, South Carolina, on a ticket with General Butler for Vice-President, who was

the regular nominee on the ticket of General Cass. This startled a portion of the Whig party, as well it might, and a movement was instantly made at Albany and New York, to put forward Mr. Clay, and it would have been done throughout the Union, if Mr. Clay had not, with equal promptitude, put his veto upon it, and arrested it.

It seems never to have been considered in the Convention which nominated General Harrison, or in that which nominated General Taylor, that for the strength of the party which secured success in both these cases, the Whigs were indebted, not exclusively, perhaps, but very largely, to Mr. Clay. Who will deny his leadership during the whole history of the party? Mr. Clay was the embodiment of Whig principles, and no other man was so much so. In his action as a statesman, he developed those principles, and gave them form and power. It was this development which brought about the unparalleled victory of 1840; and yet the Whigs chose another leader! It was the same influence —enfeebled it is true, by the abuse of it on the part of the Whigs—which achieved the Whig victory, so called, of 1848. But, by this time, it was greatly degenerated, by having fallen from the hands and control of Mr. Clay, and it was destined, for the same reason, to inevitable defeat.

But while the Whig party adhered to Mr. Clay, even professedly, he was the strength of the party. It is, therefore, one of the strangest anomalies in the history of a political party, that the very man in whom their chief strength resided, should be rejected not once, but twice, at the very moment when they wanted such an Executive chief to conduct the affairs of the nation! and when, too, no other man was so strong before the people! For how could the two things be separated—the strength of Mr. Clay as the leader of the party, and his strength as a candidate for the Presidency? It is absurd to suppose that the two things were not identical. And yet Mr. Clay was set aside, in both these instances, for men who could bear no comparison with him, in experience as statesmen, or in talent, or in executive ability. The one was ridiculed by the opposite party for his pretensions, and was carried into the Presidency on the shoulders of Mr. Clay, or which is the same thing, by the strength which Mr. Clay had given to the party; and the other had spent his life as a soldier, on the borders of the country, watching the Indians, until he suddenly acquired a military fame

in the Mexican war, to which he was justly entitled; or, as Mr. Clay says, in a letter to James Lynch and others,* "Exclusively a military man, without the least experience in civil affairs, bred up and always living in the camp, with his sword by his side and his epaulets on his shoulders, it is proposed to transfer him from the second in command of the army, to the chief magistracy of this great model republic!"

This was the consummation of apostasy from the principles of the party, so long advocated and made prominent and influential by the statesmanship, tact, and eloquence of Mr. Clay; and it was no longer the Whig party of the country. From that hour its disorganization was rapid, and it only required a little space to come to its final agony. It is now dead. It might have fallen nobly in the field of combat, if it must fall. But there was no need that it should ever fall. If the Whig party had put forward Mr. Clay for the Presidency in 1840, as they were bound in honor and fidelity to their principles to do, they would have ruled the country for all time. We mean only that their policy would have been established on a basis that would never be shaken.

It is a very remarkable historical coincidence that the duration of the Jackson party, as such, after it started on the military principle, or in reliance on the military fame of their chief, was about ten years. For that principle had lost its power, and the Jackson dynasty was overthrown in 1840. The Whig party resorted to the same principle in 1840, acted it out more fully in 1848, and by the time ten years had elapsed after this apostasy, their doom as a party was sealed. So far as this remarkable historical coincidence goes to establish a proposition, it may be assumed that the military principle, acting in such a form on a political party, in this country, is available for a cycle of about half a score of years. It is to be hoped it may never last long enough to subject the country to military rule—an apprehension so often expressed by Mr. Clay, since it first showed itself under General Jackson.

When the Jackson dynasty had fairly spent itself, the Democratic party took up a position on a platform of principles which had gradually come to their hands, vitiated indeed by the virus of the former regime. While the Whig party, in 1848, had so far degenerated as to decline publishing a platform of principles,

* Page 576, Private Correspondence.

and had fallen back on the principle of the Jackson dynasty, the Democratic party were loudly uttering their principles, so that the two great national parties had completely reversed their relative positions, the Whigs having returned to the point where the Jackson party began, which the Democrats, with wisdom, had allowed to fall into the condition of a non-user.

The contingent results to the country, of nominating and electing Mr. Clay in 1840—and he certainly would have been elected if nominated—are almost inconceivable, certainly inestimable and immeasurable. The fate of the country, whether it should rise to the highest degree of prosperity, greatness and power, or be rent by the introduction of the elements of discord, the Union shaken to its foundations, and ultimately broken into fragments, may have depended, and in the apprehensions of the most sagacious minds, did depend, on that contingency. How great, then, the responsibility of those who defeated the nomination of Mr. Clay in 1840! In 1840 was the beginning of the fall of the Whig party by the rejection of Mr. Clay; and in 1848, when the only and last chance of saving the party presented itself, it found a consummation of its destiny—all, we think, for abandoning Mr. Clay. Principles are the germs of all the fruit of human society, good or bad; and to abandon good principles, is to come to a bad end, in the case of individuals, of political parties, and of nations. Mr. Clay was consistent in his principles to the end of his days; but his party abandoned him, and it was ruined. It was the inevitable destiny of the course which they pursued.

But though Mr. Clay did not reach the Presidency, he attained a higher place—a niche in ever-during fame, as one of the greatest and purest of statesmen, as an orator unrivaled in his time for the effect of his eloquence, as a good citizen, as a kind father and exemplary husband, as a counselor and advocate in civil and criminal law of rare endowments, and as having succeeded, by his character and career, in gaining the love and devotion of the American people, as no American before him, or of his time, had ever done. He was a man open to the nearest access, and susceptible of the most intimate friendships. He was a man to be loved by all, because he was accessible to all. He was a man *of* the people and *for* the people. All manner of intercourse with him, whether personal, or by the mediate communication of his thoughts and sentiments, established at once a common ground

of sympathy. The humblest individuals in society felt his power, because it was natural and pertinent; and the highest felt it, because it was still a gracious condescension, which relieved them from all embarrassment. To the prince he could speak as a prince, and to the plowman as one of his own sort. It was this magic power over men of all conditions, which made him so immensely popular. It was this high place in the affections of men, won by his suavity, and by the versatility and adaptations of his genius, which made his sway more potent than that of magisterial power, and his social position more enviable than that of the chief executive of a nation. Power could never add to the splendors of his reputation, or make the world admire him one whit the more. He lives, and will forever live, in the heart of the nation he so long and so faithfully served, while some of those who have filled the chair of State, will be forgotten, and while none of them will be spoken of simply for that accidental elevation. Durable fame is that which builds itself up by promoting the common weal of human society, and in securing the affections of those who have been benefited.

It may, perhaps, be said that the Whig party tried Mr. Clay in 1844, and he was defeated. Say, rather, the Whig party was defeated. So rapid had been the disorganization of the party, and so disastrous its history, after its abandonment of Mr. Clay in 1840, that the party could do nothing else in 1844 but invoke his name and strength; and all living men in the country, of that memorable year, will forever remember, and history will record the enthusiasm and hopes with which his nomination was received and sustained. And by a fair election, and by a fair counting of votes, as we have elsewhere shown, Mr. Clay would have been declared President. What other man, after such disasters as the Whig party had experienced by rejecting Mr. Clay in 1840, could have mustered the party again in 1844? The nation again began to feel that the Whig party was still a party of principle. But alas! in 1848, they ignored all principle but the military fame of their nominee; and "they who sowed the wind, reaped the whirlwind." As a party, they are swept from the face of the earth.

It is interesting, and not less instructive, to observe the contrast between Mr. Clay's lofty position when the Whig party had abandoned him, and the downward career of that party from

that moment. While Mr. Clay was at the head of it, it was known and respected as a party of principle, and because it was a party of principle. But the moment it went off from him in 1848, and in the very act of going off, it laid on the table a proposed platform of principles, and mounted the military horse like the Jackson party of 1828 and 1832. "It is mortifying," says Mr. Clay as above cited,* "to behold that once great party descending from its lofty position of principle—known, avowed, and proclaimed principle—and lending itself to the creation of a mere personal party, with a virtual abandonment of its old principles." Again, in his letter to Henry White,† he says, "The Philadelphia Convention has placed the Whig party in a humiliating condition—one which, I fear, will impair its usefulness, *if not destroy its existence.*" Can any one conceive a more perfect transformation of character than was made in this great party at this time, by sundry of its ambitious leaders, who were tired of waiting for Mr. Clay; that is, tired of waiting on principle, to which, in all the former parts of their history, Mr. Clay's leadership had ever trained and held them fast; but who now broke loose from his guidance, and made one fearful plunge, dragging the party with them into a headlong career, without a single principle to guide them, except a military feather that waved in the breeze before their vision! A party which had been born and rocked in the cradle of opposition to this principle twenty years before, which grew up to manhood and strength under the nurturing hand of Mr. Clay, and which, under his banner, was prepared for a glorious triumph in 1840, now, in 1848, turned away from the beckoning hand and warning voice of their great Captain, and bowed themselves down in adoration of that very principle which, from their infancy as a party, their political catechism had taught them to denounce as fraught with danger to the interests of the country! And yet they made the plunge, and history has already declared the result. THEY ARE NO MORE!

But in the fall of his party, there stood Mr. Clay erect, with eagle eye fastened on the principles he had so long cherished and taught, and looking down in sorrow on the great political family he had taken so much pains to rear. A chieftain still, of the same lofty bearing, even in the hour of his desertion by false friends, still commanding and receiving the homage of all—and

* Page 571, Private Correspondence. † Page 573, ibid.

they were a moiety of a great nation—who had been accustomed to admire and love him, and who were still, to the very last, faithful to him, he occupied even higher ground, certainly more hallowed, than to have been borne into the Presidency by the shouts of a victorious party. While an impartial world turns away with disgust, if not with a shudder, from such defection as Mr. Clay experienced in this trying hour, it will render involuntary homage to that fidelity to principle which beams so effulgently from Mr. Clay's character to his last hour as a public man, and as a private individual. It will ever be said of him, THAT was the MAN who could never be swerved from his convictions of right.

CHAPTER V.

Mr. Clay again in the Senate of the United States.—What the Senate may do while waiting for the Organization of the House.—Are you Married or Single?—Mr. Clay's Plea to admit Father Matthew on the floor.—A tie Vote for Chaplain.—Pleasantry and Sarcasm of Mr. Clay.—Mr. Clay on Mr. Cass's Resolution to suspend Diplomatic Intercourse with Austria.—Mr. Clay on the Purchase of the Manuscript Copy of Washington's Farewell Address.—On the Purchase of Mount Vernon.

In November, 1848, Mr. Clay was again returned to the Senate of the United States, by the unanimous voice of the Legislature of Kentucky, for the six year's term, beginning the 4th of March, 1849. There was at that time a storm lowering in the political horizon of the country, on the slavery question, threatening to dissolve the Union, which must necessarily burst over Congress, in legislating for the new territories brought into the Union by the result of the Mexican war; and it was the earnest desire of the State of Kentucky, and of the country generally, that Mr. Clay, who had drawn the lightning from former clouds of the same aspects, and hushed the tempest, and whose counsels always availed in every difficult or alarming crisis of public affairs, should be in the councils of the nation in this approaching and eventful struggle. He had been rejected on the question as to who should stand at the helm of the ship of state; and if he had been unamiable, he might have said, let her sink or be wrecked. But Mr. Clay, though reluctantly, yielded again to the call of his country, and took his seat in the Senate of the United States, on the 3d of December, 1849, nearly forty-three years after his first appearance as a member of that body.

The first session of the Thirty-first Congress met on Monday, the 3d of December, 1849; but the House of Representatives was not organized by the election of a Speaker till the 22d of December. Touching the right of the Senate to act, while waiting for the organization of the House, Mr. Clay, on the 15th

of December, speaking to a resolution offered by Senator Berrien of Georgia, said:

"The Senate, as is well known, occupies two relations to the House of Representatives, both a legislative and judicial one; and a third relation having no connection with it [the Senate]—a relation to the Executive Department of the Government. Now, sir, though we are not able to co-operate with the House, it certainly forms no reason why we should not perform our duties as a component part of the Executive of the country. * * * If we can proceed, then, to the consideration of Executive business, so far from the House taking exception to our course, they ought to be pleased that we shall be enabled to go on with the public business when they shall be ready, unobstructed by those matters which fall exclusively within the relations of this body to the Executive."

As the same occurrence of the non-election of a Speaker of the House of Representatives is liable to happen at the opening of any session of Congress, the above remarks of Mr. Clay on this occasion are worthy of record, as presenting the rule, and the only rule, that can guide the action of the Senate in such a case. It is clear that the Senate can not proceed to acts of legislation till the House is organized.

In Senate, December 27, 1849, Mr. Clay said:

"I have in my hand the petition of Miss or Mrs.—I do not know which—and that is a matter of public inconvenience often. I should be very glad if, by universal consent, some mark might be adopted so that you might know, when a strange lady addresses you, whether she is married or single. I have often been exceedingly embarrassed on this question, and am so in this case, but I suppose she is married. She signs her name Abigail Shaler Stilwell, and is the sister of one of the worthiest men I have ever known in the public service."

The author has often observed, in the examination of Mr. Clay's correspondence, that he had been embarrassed with this same difficulty in the signatures of females, who had occasion to write to him, as in the case above-mentioned. It is obvious enough that the signature of Nancy —— does not decide whether the person is married or unmarried.

A resolution was introduced into the Senate to admit Father Matthew within the bar, and Mr. Clemens, of Alabama, ob-

ected, on the ground that Father Matthew had interfered with slavery:

Mr. Clay said:

"Mr. President, I confess I have heard with great regret this opposition. * * * It is a very small affair. * * * That resolution is an honor to humanity, to philanthropy, to virtue; it is a merited tribute to a man who has achieved a great social revolution—a revolution in which there has been no blood shed, no desolation inflicted, no tears of widows and orphans extracted, and one of the greatest that has been achieved by any of the benefactors of mankind. I put it, in all seriousness, in the spirit of the most perfect kindness, to the honorable Senator from Alabama, whether this pushing forward the subject of slavery in its collateral and remote branches, upon all possible occasions that may arise during our deliberations in this body, is not impolitic, unwise, and injurious to the stability of that very institution which I have no doubt the honorable gentleman would uphold. * * * This is a compliment which, I venture to say, the hearts of all mankind award to this distinguished foreigner—a compliment no less due to him for his great services in the cause of humanity than it is due to him as an Irish patriot."

Every one will see how quick Mr. Clay's heart bounds to the right place, on every occasion of this kind.

It is a singular fact that, in choosing a chaplain of the Senate, January 9, 1850, there being a tie vote, the question arose, and was debated at some length, whether the Chair had a casting vote. The Constitution reads thus: "The Vice-president shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote except when the Senate are equally divided."

Impatient at such a waste of time in debate on a question so clear, Mr. Clay rose and said, very emphatically: "It is the precise case for which the Constitution provides."

It was difficult for Mr. Clay to resist the penciling of a picture, when it was a good one, or touched his fancy. In the Senate, January 17, 1850, Mr Clay said:

"Really, sir, I have no wish to interfere in this contest [about appointments in California] between the two honorable senators — the senator from Connecticut [Hon. Truman Smith] and the senator from Illinois [Hon. Stephen A. Douglas]. It seems to me to be a pretty equal combat; for, if the honorable Senator from Connecticut has the advantage in size, as he

certainly has, the honorable Senator from Illinois has undoubtedly greatly the advantage in position, and makes up for that for any difference of size between them."

Mr. Smith was of good stature and stout, and Mr. Douglas so diminutively small as to be universally called the LITTLE GIANT.

Again, on one occasion, when Senator Foote, of Mississippi, had expressed his astonishment at Mr. Clay's inconsistency, Mr. Clay said :

"The worthy Senator will allow me to say that I really can not govern his emotions. He is a gentleman of fine imagination and great fancy; and if he will permit himself to be operated upon by certain emotions that produce fancies which he can find no language to express, I can not help it. It must be the fault of his own peculiar constitution."

One must have known the two men, fully to appreciate this piece of sarcasm.

Mr. Cass had introduced a resolution in the Senate directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to inquire into the expediency of suspending diplomatic intercourse with Austria, because of her treatment of the Hungarians; and he spoke largely and eloquently of the greatness of our country, and of the spirit of progress. But Mr. Clay could not exactly see the connection between Mr. Cass's premises and his conclusion. True, Austria had treated the Hungarians badly, but Russia had treated them worse; and if it were proper for the United States to interfere in these matters, we should first call Russia to account. No man could be more sensible of the barbarities of Austria toward the Hungarians than Mr. Clay, and no one sympathized more sincerely or more profoundly than he, with the sufferers in those calamities. But what reason could this be for us to take an incipient step to a war, and to set ourselves up as umpire, uncalled, between foreign nations; or what principle of public law, or of our own characteristic national policy, would justify us in interfering with their disputes?

Mr. Cass ranked Mr. Clay among the stand-still politicians, and avowed that he (Mr. Cass) was in favor of progress. Whereupon Mr. Clay very pertinently, and with no small force of sarcasm, arraigned his (Mr. Cass's) creed, and that of his party, on the subject of progress in internal improvements, and in other

branches of domestic policy, wherein Mr. Clay thought progress might be very useful. He would go with Mr. Cass, or any other man, in that progress which would secure the prosperity and grandeur of the country; but as for that progress sought for by interfering in the affairs of foreign nations, and in provoking them to war with us, for the propagation of our peculiar sentiments, he (Mr. Clay) should pause on the threshold.

The following are Mr. Clay's remarks in reply to Mr. Cass, January 7, 1850:

"Sir, I think that the question ought to be treated as if it were a direct proposition to suspend diplomatic intercourse with the power indicated in the original resolution. And, sir, I have been very much struck with the want of sympathy between the premises and conclusion of the honorable senator from Michigan. In his premises he depicted the enormities of Austrian despotism. Who doubts the perpetration of those enormities? In the most glowing strains of eloquence, he portrayed to us the wrongs of suffering Hungary. Who doubts them? He speaks of the atrocious executions committed by her—the disgrace of the age, and, above all, of Austria. Who doubts it? These were the premises of the honorable senator; but what was his conclusion? It was requiring the recall of a little Chargé d'Affaires that we happen to have at Vienna! Why, the natural conclusion would be to declare war immediately against Austria, if she had committed such enormities; though, from the impossibility of coming in contact with her, this resource might be difficult of accomplishment. But, sir, there is another mode that is much more congenial, much more compatible with the course we ought to take. The exiles from suffering and bleeding Hungary are now scattered through all quarters of the globe; some have reached our hospitable shores, some are now wending their way hither, and many are scattered throughout Europe. Let the honorable senator bring forward some original plan for affording succor and relief to the exiles of Hungary—something that shall be worthy of their acceptance, and the bestowing of which, upon a brave and generous people, shall do honor to a country rich in boundless resources—something that shall be worthy of a country which is the asylum of the wretched and the oppressed from all quarters of the world—something that shall be worthy the acceptance of the gallantry and patriotism with which those exiles fought in defense of their own country. When the honorable senator shall have done this, then he may call on me, and call not in vain, for succor and support in behalf of a proposition such as I have indicated. * * * Sir, unfortunately, owing to causes upon which it is not necessary for me now to dwell, some

of them of a very painful nature—among which are charges against the commander-in-chief of the Hungarian army, which, if well founded, must cover him with infamy—unfortunately, Hungary fell suddenly, and to the surprise of the American world. She is subdued; she is crushed.

Now, if we adopt this resolution, I have been curious to satisfy myself upon what principle we can vindicate it. What principle does it involve? It involves the principle of assuming, on the part of this Government, a right to pass judgment upon the conduct of foreign powers—a branch of the subject that has been well treated of by the senator who sits before me (Mr. Hale). Have we any such power? The most extensive bearing of the principle involved in the resolution proposed by the honorable senator from Michigan, assumes the right, on the part of this nation, to pronounce upon the conduct of all other nations, and to follow it up by some direct action, such as the suspending of intercourse. We are directing, at present, the exercise of that power toward a nation, on account of the manner in which they have conducted a war, or of the manner in which they have treated the unfortunate prisoners who were taken during the progress of that war. But where is to be the limit? You begin with war. You may extend the same principle of action to politics or religion—to society or to social principles and habits.

The honorable senator before me (Mr. Hale) has spoken of the conduct of Russia; and undoubtedly, as between Russia and Austria, I consider Russia the more culpable. It is true, she had a pretext for her interference. She was afraid of the contagion of liberty in Hungary, lest it might affect her coterminous possessions. That was the pretext for her interference. In the case, however, of Austria, though I think Hungary was right and Austria wrong in respect to the cause and object of the war, still there were relations existing between Hungary and Austria which did not exist between Hungary and Russia. Russia's interference, then, was voluntary, spontaneous, uncalled for. She had no such pretext or ground for it as Austria had, in endeavoring to subjugate those whom she was pleased to call rebellious subjects; and yet the honorable senator has permitted Russia to pass—and, by the by, allow me to say that, but for the interference of Russia, Hungary would have succeeded. She *had* succeeded, and she would have eventually triumphed in the struggle with Austria. The honorable senator, instead of directing his proposition against Russia, as I would have done, directs it against Austria, the less offending power of the two, and proposes to pass Russia by unnoticed. But if the principle contained in the proposition be true, we have a right to examine into the conduct of Russia, and into that of other nations. Where, then, is the limit? You may extend it to religion. You may extend it to the Inquisition. Have we not an equal right to say to

Spain, 'Unless you abolish the Inquisition, we will suspend diplomatic intercourse with you?' * * * Sir, if we are to become the defenders of nations, the censurers of other powers, I again ask the honorable senator where are we to stop? and why does he confine himself to Austria alone?

"Mr. President, the honorable senator admitted that he entertained an apprehension that I was one of those stationary politicians who refuse to advance as the age advances; one of those politicians, I think his expression was, that stand still; that *he* was in favor of Progress—in favor of going ahead. Sir, I should like to understand the meaning of this word 'Progress,' of which the honorable senator speaks. I should like to hear a definition of it. Has not this nation progressed with most astonishing rapidity in point of population? Has it not by far exceeded, in this respect, every other nation in the world? Has it not progressed in commerce and manufactures? Has it not increased in power with a rapidity greater than has ever been known before in the case of any nation under the sun? What is the progress which the honorable senator means? I am afraid that it is not an internal progress he is in favor of; for, whatever his own peculiar opinions may be, the school of which he is a distinguished disciple is opposed, as I understand, to the improvement of our magnificent harbors and rivers—of our glorious watercourses throughout the country. This is not the progress, I apprehend, which the honorable senator is in favor of. And, again, with respect to the manufactures of the country, I do not understand the doctrines of the party to which the honorable senator belongs to be in favor of progress there. They are for *arresting* progress. Their progress is backward in reference to these matters; not intentionally so, I admit, but by the course of their policy, they carry us back to the colonial days, when we depended upon Great Britain for every thing in the way of supplies that were necessary to existence.

"What, then, is the progress which the honorable senator seems so desirous of making? Ah! I am afraid that it is progress in foreign wars. I am afraid it is progress in foreign conquest—in territorial aggrandizement. I am afraid it is progress as the disturbers of the possessions of our neighbors throughout this continent and throughout the islands adjacent to it. If that be the progress which the honorable senator wishes to effect, I trust that it will be long before the country engages in any such object as that; at least, at the expense of the peaceable portion of the world.

"Sir, the gentleman says—what we all know—that this is a great country, a vast country; great in fact, and will be still greater in future if we conduct things with prudence, discretion, and wisdom; but that very greatness draws after it great responsibilities, and those responsibilities should incline us to use the

vast power with which we have been blessed by the kindness of Providence, so as to promote justice, so as to avoid unnecessary wars, maintaining our own rights with firmness, but invading the rights of no others. We should be content with the almost limitless extent of territory which we now possess, stretching from ocean to ocean, containing millions upon millions of acres as yet uninhabited.

"Sir, if the progress which the honorable senator means is a progress to be accomplished by foreign wars, and foreign conquest, and foreign territorial aggrandizement, I thank God that I belong to the party that is stationary—that is standing still. If that is not his object, I should like to know what he means by progress. I should like to meet with a definition of the kind of progress which he thinks it is desirable for this country to make.

"Mr. President, I have risen late in the evening, really intending to have said much less than I have said; and I must conclude by expressing the hope that the Senate of the United States, when they come to deliberate seriously upon the consequence of the adoption of such a resolution as this, will pause; that they will not open a new field of collision terminating perhaps in war, and exposing ourselves to the reaction of Foreign Powers, who, when they see us assuming to judge of their conduct, will undertake in their turn to judge of *our* conduct. We ought to recollect that, with the sole exception of France, whose condition is yet somewhat obscured in doubt and uncertainty as to the fate of a republic which she has established, we stand the leading Republic amid all the Powers of the earth, an example of a free Government, and that we should not venture to give to the other nations even a pretext, much less cause, to separate themselves from us, by undertaking to judge of their conduct, and applying to them a rule by which we might denationalize nation after nation, according as their conduct may be found to correspond with our notion and judgment of what is right and proper in the administration of human affairs. Sir, it does not become us to take such perilous and unnecessary grounds, and I trust that we shall not adopt such a course. I see no necessity for referring this resolution to a committee. I think it would be unwise to adopt it, and I trust the Senate will at once negative the resolution; or, if it should be referred, confiding in the sound judgment of the Committee on Foreign Relations in anticipation, I feel perfectly sure of the rejection of the resolution by the Committee."

Mr. Cass's resolution was rejected, and a motion which he afterward made to strike out from the Appropriation Bill the item for the outfit of our Chargé to Austria, was also negatived by a decided vote.

No one can read the following remarks of Mr. Clay, made in Senate, January 24, 1850, on a resolution he had offered to that body to purchase the manuscript copy of Washington's Farewell Address, without being sensible how perfectly characteristic they are of the speaker, how pertinent to the subject, how truly eloquent and patriotic. It was an occasion well fitted to stir up the lowest depths of Mr. Clay's feelings as a man, and as an American statesman. It should be recollected, in the perusal of these remarks, that Mr. Clay then stood in the presence of those agitators, throughout the length and breadth of the Union, on the subject of slavery, which induced him, at the earnest solicitations of his friends, and of the Legislature of Kentucky, to leave once more the shades of Ashland, to exert his influence in the Senate of the United States, in connection with others, to appease this perilous strife of the country. It was at the very moment when he was preparing his resolutions of compromise—since and hereafter to be termed the Compromise of 1850. His days and nights were then devoted to this grand and pregnant theme. What an *oasis* in this desert of weary thought, was the accidental presentation of this subject by a newspaper advertisement offering for sale at auction the manuscript copy of General Washington's Farewell Address! The appeal was too strong to be resisted; and we see by his remarks how refreshing and hopeful were the workings of his mind on this occasion. Washington's Farewell Address, the original copy of which was then in the market, was exactly the theme for the time and circumstance. It was a kind of inspired text to preach a sermon from, than which nothing could be more seasonable. It came in, providentially, to back and enforce the great argument which Mr. Clay was at that moment preparing in his closet, and which resulted in the Compromise of 1850. He had only to travel backward in history, and plant himself on the platform of Washington's Farewell Address. The sentiments of his own bosom were reflected from that mirror, and he had only to echo the voice of the Father of his country, so long since, and in such solemn circumstances, sounded out as an admonition to the American people. Mr. Clay said:

"It is about fifty-three years ago since General Washington, the Father of his Country, by universal consent, addressed to the people of the United States the document described in that resolution [offered by Mr. Clay, January 20, 1850]. At the time

of the preparation of it, there was a paper, which those who are conversant with the history of the country at the time, will recollect was published at Philadelphia by an extremely respectable and intelligent gentleman, Mr. Claypoole, called the *Daily Advertiser*. General Washington selected that paper for the publication of his Farewell Address; and after it was committed to print, Mr. Claypoole proposed to return the original document to General Washington, and waited upon him for that purpose; but being extremely desirous to possess it, he expressed his wish to General Washington that he would like to retain it as a memorial of him. General Washington assented, and from that day to this, the paper has been in the hands, either of Mr. Claypoole or of some of his descendants.

"I was struck by an advertisement, which I saw some short time ago, published in one of the papers of Philadelphia, to this effect:—

"'The original manuscript of General Washington's Valedictory Address to the people of the United States, will be sold on Tuesday, February 12, 1850, at half past six o'clock, P. M. This paper, in the handwriting, and bearing the signature of General Washington, was presented by him to Mr. Claypoole, the then editor and proprietor of the *Daily Advertiser*—the paper which General Washington had selected for its publication. The sale will be peremptory.'

"Well, sir, when I read that advertisement, I said to myself, what is to become of this precious document? Is it to be sold, perhaps to be transferred out of the country, and made the ornament of the parlor of some of the distinguished men of Europe—men of rank, or title, or literary fame? Or, shall it remain here? Sir, I could not for a moment hesitate as to the promptings of my own heart. I said—'Here—here in this Capitol, in the Library of this nation, ought this document to be deposited.'

"Mr. President, man is not an abstraction. He is a being possessing feelings, sensations, sympathies; and allow me also to say, sir, that, although we may derive great pleasure in having the narratives of the glory of our ancestors, and the deeds of the men of celebrity in our own country, yet some physical memorial of them, some tangible, palpable object, always addresses itself to our hearts and to our feelings. Sir, is there a son living, who, on the death of his father, will not look with pride and satisfaction upon the objects which were dear to that father during his lifetime—upon the cane which sustained his tottering steps in the latter period of his life, upon the watch which he wore, upon the horse on which he rode, upon the saddle on which he sat, upon the cup from which his thirst was quenched? And, sir, is there an American son of Washington, as we all are, who can not and who will not always look with pleasure and satisfaction upon the objects with which his name was connected?

"Sir, in my own humble parlor at Ashland, I have at this moment, a broken goblet which was used by General Washington during almost the whole of the Revolutionary war. It was in his camp, confided to me by an old lady of some eighty years of age; and, sir, there is nothing in that parlor so much revered, or which is an object of greater admiration by the stranger who comes to see me. This feeling of attachment to these objects, associated with the memory of those we venerate, and whom we loved during their life time, is not merely a private feeling of attachment; it is a broader, more comprehensive, and national feeling. Do we not all recollect how the hearts of all France thrilled with joy when they learned that the remains of Napoleon were to be transported from the island of St. Helena back to that country upon which he had shed so much glory? Do we not all recollect with what sensations of indignation England heard the proposition to transport the remains of the humble dwelling—it was, indeed, humble—in which Shakspeare had his birth? And how indignant did we feel when we heard the report—though fortunately it turned out not to be true—that some desperate robber had violated the grave of Washington himself, for the purpose of transporting his remains to a distant land? Sir, these are feelings which are worthy of being countenanced and cherished by public authority.

"To say nothing of the nature and character of that address, who is there, sir, amid the discordance and ungrateful sounds of disunion and discord which assail our ears in every part of this country, and in both halls of Congress—who, I ask, is there that would not find refreshment and delight behind the Farewell Address of Washington to the people of this country? Who is there that would not trace the paternal and patriotic advice with pleasure, which was written by his own hand—that hand which, after having grasped the sword that achieved the liberties of our country, traced with the instrument of peace the document which then gave us that advice, so necessary to preserve and transmit to posterity the treasure he had bestowed upon us? Who is there, in tracing that advice to beware of sectional division, to beware of demagogues, to beware of the consequences of indulging a spirit of disunion—who is there, in reading these lines of truly paternal advice, that will not in imagination transport himself back to the period when they were committed to paper by the hand of Washington, and think of the emotions, the paternal and patriotic emotions, at that precious moment, which must have animated his breast?"

It was this same day that Mr. Clay had occasion to present a petition to the Senate for the purchase of Mount Vernon, on which occasion he said:

"I have been very much struck, Mr. President, with what seemed to be a most remarkable coincidence. I have submitted a resolution which I hope the Senate will permit to be taken up and passed, relating to the purchase of the manuscript copy of the Farewell Address of the Father of his country. I had scarcely presented that resolution when I was requested to go to the door, where I met a stranger who bore a petition from Pennsylvania, numerously signed, requesting Congress to purchase Mount Vernon. The petitioners state that, in their opinion, that property should be national; that it is less accessible in the hands of private individuals than it should be; but that, if it belonged to the Republic, all could repair to it, as to the political Mecca of their country. I ask that the petition be received, and referred to the Committee for the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

The critical Condition of the Country.—Mr. Clay's Resolutions of Compromise, and his Opening Remarks upon them.—The Boundary of Texas on the West and North-West, as Claimed by Herself.—The Consequences of the false Pretext of Congress for the Mexican War.—Origin of the Wilmot Proviso.—General Taylor opposed to the Claims of Texas, and Danger of Civil War.—Mr. Rusk and other Senators oppose Mr. Clay's Resolutions.

THE last great effort of Mr. Clay's public life, and that which hastened the termination of his earthly career, remains to be told. The country was in a peculiar and critical condition, arising from the annexation of Texas, the Mexican war that followed, and the acquisition of new and vast territories. The great question was, whether the purpose of the war for the extension of slavery should be consummated by the legislation required for the government of the newly-acquired territories; or whether it should be disappointed. For, that the extension of the domain of slavery *was* the secret purpose of the war, can hardly be doubted by those who believe in moral necessity, and that men who are invested with power will act as their interests and passions incline them. Mr. Tyler, in going out of power, consummated the annexation of Texas; and Mr. Polk, his successor, adopted the policy which annexation involved—war, conquest, and the extension of the "area of freedom," as the political slang of the day denominated it—the meaning of which could not be concealed by such a robe. The holiest names must needs be prostituted to the most unholy of purposes. The world forgets the origin of the name of Jesuits, in the tracery of the dark history of crime which it suggests, and is shocked, when reminded that the highest style of the Saviour of mankind is in it. So may the pretext of freedom be perverted to unholy ends.

Mr. Clay could not violate his conscience in promoting the

extension of slavery, though no man would go further than he in vindicating the constitutional rights of the South against the Abolitionists of the North. But he regarded slavery as an evil. The annexation of Texas, however, had been effected, the war had come, and its conquests remained upon our hands. Should these conquests be used for the benefit of slavery or for freedom? Not to use them for the former purpose, would be a disappointment of the original and main design of the war. It was a question of no less import that constituted the great strife of the first session of the Thirty-first Congress; and Mr. Clay was a leader in the combat. But Mr. Clay was the man of compromise. When Missouri knocked at the door of Congress for admission into the Union, she knocked on the heart of the nation, and stirred up the strongest passions for and against slavery. The controversy was in the most alarming degree menacing, when Mr. Clay stepped in with his Compromise, in 1821, and stilled the waves which rolled in fearful volumes over the wide surface of the Republic. When Nullification raged in the South, and menaced disturbance to the peace, and violence to the integrity of the Union, in 1833, again Mr. Clay came forward with his Compromise, pouring oil on the troubled waters, and restored tranquillity and contentment; and the last public effort of his life was in the way of compromise. He meant, he wished no unfairness to the South. He was himself a southern man, and a slaveholder. He would protect their constitutional rights to the last item of any just claim. But he would also respect the feelings of the North—the feelings of mankind, and the public opinion of the world. He would never consent that the national escutcheon of the Federal Republic of North America should be stained with the propagandism of slavery.

But how should this new and great question be settled? There were elements in it of a very complex, and of an extremely novel character. The Thirtieth Congress had adjourned without organizing the new Territories, or settling any great principles as to their future government and destiny, and left them to take care of themselves as well as they could; with an executive supervision from Washington, indeed, involving a lofty and almost unlimited discretion, the use of which might or might not be judicious. California had gone forward without asking leave, formed a state government prohibiting slavery, and

put its machinery in operation. Utah was governed by a high and arbitrary spiritual despotism, the character of which, so far as known, shocked the sentiments of the civilized world; and New Mexico was under military rule, ordered from the seat of Federal power, in conflict with the claims of Texas, which, from time to time, exhibited the menacing aspect of being asserted by force of arms.

In this state of things, Mr. Clay, on the 29th of January, brought forward in the Senate of the United States, his famed resolutions for compromise.

These resolutions, and the remarks which accompanied them when they were first introduced, occupy so prominent and so important a place in Mr. Clay's history, that it is thought proper to cite them here without abridgment. On the day above named, Mr. Clay rose in the Senate, and said:

"Mr. President, I hold in my hand a series of resolutions which I desire to submit to the consideration of this body. Taken together, in combination, they propose an amicable arrangement of all questions in controversy between the free and the slave States, growing out of the subject of slavery. It is not my intention, Mr. President, at this time, to enter into a full and elaborate discussion of each of these resolutions, taken separately, or the whole of them combined together, as composing a system of measures; but I desire to present a few observations upon each resolution, with the purpose chiefly of exposing it fairly and fully before the Senate and before the country; and I may add, with the indulgence of the Senate, toward the conclusion, some general observations upon the state of the country, and the condition of the questions to which the resolutions relate. Whether they shall or shall not meet with the approbation and concurrence of the Senate, as I most ardently hope they may, as I most sincerely believe they ought, I trust that at least some portion of the long time which I have devoted with care and deliberation, to the preparation of these resolutions, and to the presentation of this great national scheme of compromise and harmony, will be employed by each senator before he pronounces against the propositions embraced in these resolutions. The resolutions, sir, are all preceded by a short preamble, to which, of course, I attach no very great importance. The preamble and first resolution are as follows:

"'It being desirable for the peace, concord, and harmony of the union of these States to settle and adjust amicably all existing questions of controversy between them arising out of the institution of slavery, upon a fair, equitable, and just basis: Therefore

"'1st. *Resolved*, That California, with suitable boundaries, ought, upon her application, to be admitted as one of the States of this Union, without the imposition by Congress of any restriction in respect to the exclusion or introduction of slavery within those boundaries.'

"Mr. President, it must be acknowledged that there has been some irregularity in the movements which have terminated in the adoption of a constitution by California, and in the expression of her wish, not yet formally communicated to Congress it is true, but which may be anticipated in a few days, to be admitted into the Union as a State. There has been some irregularity in the manner in which they have framed that constitution. It was not preceded by any act of Congress authorizing the Convention, and designating the boundaries of the proposed State, according to all the early practice of this Government, according to all the cases of the admission of new States into this Union, which occurred, I think, prior to that of Michigan. Michigan, if I am not mistaken, was the first State which, unbidden, unauthorized by any previous act of Congress, undertook to form for herself a constitution, and to knock at the door of Congress for admission into the Union. I recollect that at the time when Michigan thus presented herself, I was opposed, in consequence of that deviation from the early practice of the Government, to the admission. The majority determined otherwise; and it must be in candor admitted by all men, that California had much more reason to do what she has done, unsanctioned and unauthorized by a previous act of Congress, than Michigan had to do what she did.

"Sir, notwithstanding the irregularity of the admission of Michigan into the Union, it has been a happy event. She forms now one of the bright stars of this glorious Confederacy. She has sent here to mingle in our councils senators and representatives—men eminently distinguished, with whom we may all associate with pride, with pleasure, and with satisfaction. And I trust that if California, irregular as her previous action may have been in the adoption of a constitution, but more justifiable than was the action of Michigan—if she also shall be admitted, as is proposed by the first resolution, with suitable limits, that she, too, will make her contribution of wisdom, of patriotism, and of good feeling to this body, in order to conduct the affairs of this great and boundless empire.

"The resolution proposes her admission when she applies for it. There is no intention on my part to anticipate such an application, but I thought it right to present this resolution as a part of the general plan which I propose for the adjustment of these unhappy difficulties.

"The second resolution, sir, is as follows:

"'2d. *Resolved*, That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by

the United States from the republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction into or exclusion from any part of the said territory; and that appropriate territorial governments ought to be established by Congress in all of the said territory, not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery.'

"This resolution, sir, proposes, in the first instance, a declaration of two truths, one of law and the other of fact. The truth of law which it declares is, that there does not exist at this time slavery within any portion of the territory acquired by the United States from Mexico. When I say, sir, it is a truth, I speak my own solemn and deliberate conviction. I am aware that some gentlemen have held a different doctrine; but I persuade myself that they themselves, when they come to review the whole ground, will see sufficient reasons for a change, or at least a modification of their opinions; but that, at all events, if they adhere to that doctrine, they will be found to compose a very small minority of the whole mass of the people of the United States.

"The next truth which the resolution asserts is, that slavery is not likely to be introduced into any portion of that territory. That is a matter of fact; and all the evidence upon which the fact rests, is, perhaps, as accessible to other senators as it is to me; but I must say that, from all I have heard or read, from the testimony of all the witnesses I have seen and conversed with, from all that has transpired and is transpiring, I do believe that not within one foot of the territory acquired by us from Mexico will slavery ever be planted, and I believe it could not be done even by the force and power of public authority.

"Sir, facts are daily occurring to justify me in this opinion. Sir, what has occurred? And upon that subject, and indeed upon this whole subject, I invite senators from the free States especially to consider what has occurred even since the last session—even since the commencement of this session—since they left their respective constituencies without an opportunity of consulting with them upon that great and momentous fact—the fact that California herself, of which it was asserted and predicted that she never would establish slavery within her limits when she came to be admitted as a State; that California herself, embracing, of all other portions of the country acquired by us from Mexico, that country into which it would have been most likely that slavery should have been introduced; that California herself has met in convention, and by a unanimous vote, embracing in that body slaveholders from the State of Mississippi, as well as from other parts, who concurred in the resolution—that California by a unanimous vote, has declared against the introduction of slavery within her limits. I think, then, that taking

this leading fact in connection with all the evidence we have from other sources on the subject, I am warranted in the conclusion which constitutes the second truth which I have stated in this resolution, that slavery is 'not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by us from Mexico.'

"Sir, the latter part of the resolution asserts that it is the duty of Congress to establish appropriate territorial governments within all the country acquired from Mexico, exclusive of California, not embracing in the acts by which these governments shall be constituted either a prohibition or admission of slavery.

"Sir, much as I am disposed to defer to high authority, anxious as I really am to find myself in a position that would enable me to co-operate heartily with the other departments of the government in conducting the affairs of this great people, I must say that I can not without a dereliction of duty consent to an abandonment of them without government, leaving them to all those scenes of disorder, confusion, and anarchy, which I apprehend, in respect of some of them, there is too much reason to anticipate will arise. It is the duty, the solemn—I was going to add the most sacred—duty of Congress to legislate for their government, if they can, and, at all events, to legislate for them, and to give them the benefit of law, and order, and security.

"The next resolutions are the third and fourth, which, having an immediate connection with each other, should be read and considered together. They are as follows:

"'3d. *Resolved*, That the western boundary of the State of Texas ought to be fixed on the Rio del Norte, commencing one marine league from its mouth, and running up that river to the southern line of New Mexico; thence with that line eastwardly, and so continuing in the same direction to the line established between the United States and Spain, excluding any portion of New Mexico, whether lying on the east or west of that river.'

"'4th. *Resolved*, That it be proposed to the State of Texas, that the United States will provide for the payment of all that portion of the legitimate and *bona fide* public debt of that State, contracted prior to its annexation to the United States, and for which the duties on foreign imports were pledged by the said State to its creditors, not exceeding the sum of $——, in consideration of the said dues so pledged having been no longer applicable to that object after the said annexation, but having thenceforward become payable to the United States; and upon the condition also, that the said State of Texas shall, by some solemn and authentic act of her legislature, or of a convention, relinquish to the United States any claim which it has to any part of New Mexico.

"Mr. President, I do not mean now, I do not know that I shall at any time (it is a very complex subject, and one not free from difficulty) to go into the question of what are the true limits of

Texas. My own opinion is, I must say, without intending by the remark to go into any argument, that Texas has not a good title to any portion of what is called New Mexico. And yet, sir, I am free to admit that, looking at the grounds which her representatives assumed, first in the war with Santa Anna in 1836, then at what transpired between Mr. Trist and the Mexican negotiators when the treaty of peace was negotiated, and then the fact that the United States have acquired all the country which Texas claimed as constituting a portion of her territory; looking at all these facts, but without attaching to them, either together or separately, the same degree of force which gentlemen who think that Texas has a right to New Mexico do, I must say that there is plausibility, to say the least of it, in the pretensions that she sets up to New Mexico. I do not think that they constitute or demonstrate the existence of a good title, but a plausible one. Well, then, sir, what do I propose? Without entering into any inquiry whether the Nueces or the Rio Grande was the true boundary of Texas, I propose, by the first of these two resolutions, that its western limits shall be fixed on the Rio del Norte, extending west from the Sabine to the mouth of the Rio del Norte, and that it shall follow up the Bravo or the Rio del Norte, to where it strikes the southern line of New Mexico, and then, diverging from that line, follow on in that direction until it reaches the line as fixed by the United States and Spain, by their treaty of 1819; and thus embracing a vast country, abundantly competent to form two or three States—a country which I think the highest ambition of her greatest men ought to be satisfied with as a State and member of this Union.

"But, sir, the second of these resolutions makes a proposition to the State of Texas upon which I desire to say a few words. It proposes that the Government of the United States will provide for the payment of all that portion of the debt of Texas for which the duties received upon imports from foreign countries were pledged by Texas at a time when she had authority to make pledges. How much it will amount to I have endeavored to ascertain, but all the means requisite to the ascertainment of the sum have not been received, and it is not very essential at this time, because it is the principle and not the amount that is most worthy of consideration. Now, sir, the ground upon which I base this liability on the part of the United States to pay a specified portion of the debt of Texas is not new to me. It is one which I have again and again announced to be an opinion entertained by me. I think it is founded upon principles of truth and eternal justice. Texas, being an independent power, recognized as such by all the great powers of the earth, invited loans to be made to her, to enable her to prosecute the then existing war between her and Mexico. She told those whom she invited to make these loans, that 'if you make them, the duties on foreign

imports shall be sacredly pledged for the reimbursement of the loans.' The loans were made. The money was received, and expended in the establishment of her liberty and her independence. After all this, she annexed herself to the United States, who thenceforward acquired the right to the identical pledge which she had made to the public creditor to satisfy the loan of money which he had advanced to her. The United States became the owners of that pledge, and the recipient of all the duties payable in the ports of Texas.

"Now, sir, I do say that, in my humble judgment, if there be honor, or justice, or truth among men, we do owe to the creditors who thus advanced their money upon that pledge, the reimbursement of the money, at all events to the extent that the pledged fund would have reimbursed it, if it had never been appropriated by us to our use. We must recollect, sir, that in relation to that pledge, and to the loan made in virtue and on the faith of it, there were three parties bound—I mean after annexation—the United States, Texas, and the creditor of Texas, who had advanced his money on the faith of a solemn pledge made by Texas.

"Texas and the United States might do what they thought proper; but in justice they could do nothing to deprive the creditor of a full reliance upon the pledge upon the faith of which he had advanced his money. Sir, it is impossible now to ascertain how much would have been received from that source of revenue by the State of Texas, if she had remained independent. It would be most unjust to go there now and examine at Galveston and her other ports, to ascertain how much she now receives by her foreign imports; because, by being incorporated into this Union, all her supplies, which formerly were received from foreign countries, and subject—many of them at least—to import duties, are now received by the coasting trade, instead of being received from other countries, as they would have been, if she had remained independent. Considering the extent of her territory, and the rapid manner in which her population is increasing, and is likely to increase, it is probable that in the course of a few years there might have been such an amount received at the various ports of Texas—she remaining independent—as would have been adequate to the extinction of the debt to which I have referred.

"But, sir, it is not merely in the discharge of what I consider to be a valid and legitimate obligation resting upon the United States to discharge the specified duty, it is not upon that condition alone that this payment is proposed to be made; it is also upon the further condition that Texas shall relinquish to the United States any claim that she has to any portion of New Mexico. Now, sir, although, as I believe, she has not a valid title to any portion of New Mexico, she has a claim; and for the

sake of that general quiet and harmony, for the sake of that accommodation, which ought to be as much the object of legislation as it is of individuals in their transactions in private life, we may do now what an individual in analogous circumstances might do—give something for the relinquishment of a claim, although it should not be well founded, for the sake of peace. It is, therefore, proposed—and this resolution does propose—that we shall pay the amount of the debt contracted by Texas prior to its annexation to the United States, in consideration of our reception of the duties applicable to the extinction of that debt; and that Texas shall also, in consideration of a sum to be advanced, relinquish any claim which she has to any portion of New Mexico.

"The fifth resolution, sir, and the sixth, like the third and fourth, are somewhat connected together. They are as follows:

"'5th. *Resolved*, That it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, while that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of that State, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District.

"'6th. *But Resolved*, That it *is* expedient to prohibit within the District the slave-trade, in slaves brought into it from States or places beyond the limits of the District, either to be sold therein as merchandise, or to be transported to other markets, without the District of Columbia.'

"The first of these resolutions, Mr. President, in somewhat different language, asserts substantially no other principle than that which was asserted by the Senate of the United States twelve years ago, upon the resolutions which I then offered, and which passed—at least the particular resolution passed—by a majority of four fifths of the Senate. I allude to the resolution presented by me in 1838. I shall not enlarge on that resolution; it speaks for itself; it declares that the institution of slavery should not be abolished in the District of Columbia without the concurrence of three conditions; first, the assent of Maryland; second, the assent of the people within the District; and third, compensation to the owners of the slaves within the District for their property.

"The next resolution proposed deserves a passing remark. It is that the slave-trade within the District ought to be abolished, prohibited. I do not mean by that the alienation and transfer of slaves from the inhabitants within this District—the sale by one neighbor to another of a slave which the one owns and the other wants, that a husband may perhaps be put along with his wife, or a wife with her husband. I do not mean to touch at all the question of the right of property in slaves among persons living within the District; but the slave-trade to which I refer was, I think, pronounced an abomination more than forty years ago, by

one of the most gifted and distinguished sons of Virginia, the late Mr. Randolph. And who is there who is not shocked at its enormity? Sir, it is a great mistake at the North, if they suppose that gentlemen living in the slave States look upon one who is a regular trader in slaves with any particular favor or kindness. They are often—sometimes unjustly, perhaps—excluded from social intercourse. I have known some memorable instances of this sort. But, then, what is this trade? It is a good deal limited since the retrocession of that portion of the District formerly belonging to Virginia. There are Alexandria, Richmond, Petersburg, and Norfolk, south of the Potomac, and Baltimore, Annapolis, and perhaps other ports, north of the Potomac. Let the slave-dealer, who chooses to collect his slaves in Virginia and Maryland, go to these places; let him not come here and establish his jails, and put on his chains, and sometimes shock the sensibilities of our nature by a long train of slaves passing through that avenue leading from this Capitol to the house of the Chief Magistrate of one of the most glorious Republics that ever existed. Why should he not do it? Sir, I am sure I speak the sentiments of every Southern man, and every man coming from the slave States, when I say let it terminate, and that it is an abomination; and there is no occasion for it; it ought no longer to be tolerated.

"The seventh resolution relates to a subject embraced in a bill now under consideration by the Senate. It is as follows:

"'7th. *Resolved*, That more effectual provision ought to be made by law, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor in any State who may escape into any other State or Territory in the Union.'

"Sir, that is so evident, and has been so clearly shown by the debate which has already taken place on the subject, that I have not now occasion to add another word.

"The last resolution of the series of eight is as follows:

"'And 8th. *Resolved*, That Congress has no power to prohibit or obstruct the trade in slaves between the slaveholding States; but that the admission or exclusion of slaves brought from one into another of them, depends exclusively upon their own particular laws.'

"It is obvious that no legislation is necessary or intended to follow that resolution. It merely asserts a truth, established by the highest authority of law in this country, and, in conformity with that decision, I trust there will be one universal acquiescence.

"I should not have thought it necessary to embrace in that resolution the declaration which is embraced in it, but that I thought it might be useful in treating of the whole subject, and in accordance with the practice of our British and American an-

cestors, occasionally to resort to great fundamental principles, and bring them freshly and manifestly before our eyes, from time to time, to avoid their being violated upon any occasion.

"Mr. President, you have before you the whole series of resolutions, the whole scheme of arrangement and accommodation of these distracting questions, which I have to offer, after having bestowed on these subjects the most anxious, intensely anxious, consideration ever since I have been in this body. How far it may prove acceptable to both or either of the parties on these great questions, it is not for me to say. I think it ought to be acceptable to both. There is no sacrifice of any principle, proposed in any of them, by either party. The plan is founded upon mutual forbearance, originating in a spirit of reconciliation and concession; not of principles, but of matters of feeling. At the North, sir, I know that from feeling, by many at least cherished as being dictated by considerations of humanity and philanthropy, there exists a sentiment adverse to the institution of slavery.

"Sir, I might, I think—although I believe this project contains about an equal amount of concession and forbearance on both sides—have asked from the free States of the North a more liberal and extensive concession than should be asked from the slave States. And why, sir? With you, gentlemen senators of the free States, what is it? An abstraction, a sentiment—a sentiment, if you please, of humanity and philanthropy—a noble sentiment, when directed rightly, with no sinister or party purposes; an atrocious sentiment—a detestable sentiment—or rather the abuse of it—when directed to the accomplishment of unworthy purposes. I said that I might ask from you larger and more expansive concessions than from the slave States. And why? You are numerically more powerful than the slave States. Not that there is any difference—for upon that subject I can not go along with the ardent expression of feeling by some of my friends coming from the same class of States from which I come—not that there is any difference in valor, in prowess, in noble and patriotic daring, whenever it is required for the safety and salvation of the country, between the people of one class of States and those of the other. You are, in point of numbers, however, greater; and greatness and magnanimity should ever be allied.

"But there are other reasons why concession upon such a sub ject as this should be more liberal, more expansive, coming from the free than from the slave States. It is, as I remarked, a sentiment, a sentiment of humanity and philanthropy on your side. Ay, sir, and when a sentiment of that kind is honestly and earnestly cherished, with a disposition to make sacrifices to enforce it, it is a noble and beautiful sentiment; but, sir, when the sacrifice is not to be made by those who cherish that sentiment and

inculcate it, but by another people, in whose situation it is impossible, from their position, to sympathize and to share all and every thing that belongs to them, I must say to you, senators from the free States, it is a totally different question. On your side it is a sentiment without sacrifice, a sentiment without danger, a sentiment without hazard, without peril, without loss. But how is it on the other side, to which, as I have said, a greater amount of concession ought to be made in any scheme of compromise?

"In the first place, sir, there is a vast and incalculable amount of property to be sacrificed, and to be sacrificed, not by your sharing in the common burdens, but exclusive of you. And this is not all. The social intercourse, habit, safety, property, life, every thing is at hazard, in a greater or less degree, in the slave States.

"Sir, look at the storm which is now raging before you, beating in all its rage pitilessly on your family. They are in the South. But where are your families, where are your people, senators from the free States? They are safely housed, enjoying all the blessings of domestic comfort, peace, and quiet, in the bosoms of their own families.

"Behold, Mr. President, that dwelling-house now wrapped in flames. Listen, sir, to the rafters and beams which fall in succession, amid the crash; and the flames ascending higher and higher as they tumble down. Behold those women and children who are flying from the calamitous scene, and with their shrieks and lamentations imploring the aid of high Heaven. Whose house is that? Whose wives and children are they? Yours in the free States? No. You are looking on in safety and security, while the conflagration which I have described is raging in the slave States, and produced, not intentionally by you, but produced from the inevitable tendency of the measures which you have adopted, and which others have carried far beyond what you have wished.

"In the one scale, then, we behold setiment, sentiment, sentiment alone; in the other property, the social fabric, life, and all that makes life desirable and happy.

"But, sir, I find myself engaged much beyond what I intended, when I came this morning from my lodgings, in the exposition with which I intended these resolutions should go forth to the consideration of the world. I can not omit, however, before I conclude, relating an incident, a thrilling incident, which occurred prior to my leaving my lodgings this morning.

"A man came to my room—the same at whose instance, a few days ago, I presented a memorial calling upon Congress for the purchase of Mount Vernon for the use of the public—and, without being at all aware of what purpose I entertained in the discharge of my public duty to-day, he said to me: 'Mr. Clay,

I heard you make a remark the other day, which induces me to suppose that a precious relic in my possession would be acceptable to you.' He then drew out of his pocket, and presented to me the object which I now hold in my hand. And what, Mr. President, do you suppose it is? It is a fragment of the coffin of Washington—a fragment of that coffin in which now repose in silence, in sleep, and speechless, all the earthly remains of the venerated Father of his country. Was it portentous that it should have been thus presented to me? Was it a sad presage of what might happen to that fabric which Washington's virtue, patriotism, and valor established? No, sir, no. It was a warning voice, coming from the grave to the Congress now in session to beware, to pause, to reflect, before they lend themselves to any purposes which shall destroy that Union which was cemented by his exertions and example. Sir, I hope an impression may be made on your mind such as that which was made on mine by the reception of this precious relic.

"And, in conclusion, I now ask every senator, I entreat you, gentlemen, in fairness and candor, to examine the plan of accommodation which this series of resolutions proposes, and not to pronounce against them until convinced after a thorough examination. I move that the resolutions be read and received."

The state of the country at this time, and the great complication of the questions which had arisen out of the annexation of Texas, the Mexican war, and the Treaty of Peace, require some further elucidation here, rightly to apprehend Mr. Clay's resolutions, and the general subject involved in them.

First, as to the boundaries of Texas. Texas, at this time, claimed to the Rio Grande, and to the 42d degree of north latitude, absorbing much of the territory comprehended in the Mexican Departments of Tamaulipas, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and nearly the whole of New Mexico. Texas had not been able, either before or after annexation, to extend her actual jurisdiction beyond the valley of the Nueces, which falls into the sea at Corpus Christi, where General Taylor's army was encamped at the time he was ordered to take up his position on the Rio Grande, opposite Matamoras, and which was the commencement of the war, or of actual hostilities. The occupation of the post of Corpus Christi, by the American army, was, apparently, a tacit admission that the Nueces was the western border of Texas, and of the United States, in that quarter. Such was the opinion of the Hon. Thomas H. Benton, who argued the point at large, by a speech in the Senate of the United States. Texas, before annexation, being in a state of war with the Mexican republic,

had attempted to reduce the Department of New Mexico, the result of which was a disastrous failure.

But Congress, in its act of justification of the commencement of the war, had found it convenient to declare "that American blood had been shed on American soil," in the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, which, in fact, lay within the Mexican Department of Tamaulipas. Of course, with this declaration of Congress to support her, Texas claimed to the Rio Grande. She also claimed New Mexico, which pushed her former northern boundary of the Red River, running nearly on the line of the 34th degree of north latitude, to the 42d degree. How could Congress refuse to respect those claims, when these boundaries followed as a consequence of its declaration of hostilities against Mexico? It is true, the declaration by Congress, "that American blood was shed on American soil," was a fiction, as all know, and the claims of Texas beyond the Nueces, and above the 34th degree of north latitude, were equally without foundation. But in relation to the groundless claims of Texas, Congress had now to deal with the consequence of its own false declaration, and, as will be seen, the latter was a complete vindication and shield of the former.

Moreover, when President Polk asked for an appropriation of three millions of dollars to make peace with Mexico, the Representatives of the free States were startled at this foreshadowing of large territorial acquisitions, which, they reasoned, must be for the extension of slavery. Hence the Wilmot Proviso, that slavery should not be introduced into the territory, acquired from Mexico, which passed the House by a large majority, but failed to pass the Senate. From that time, though the Wilmot Proviso failed to become a law, it has been much used as a political test in the free States, in all the Congressional elections. Its beginning, and popular use since that time, constitute a great chapter of history. It will be a long time before it will cease to ring in the ears of the public. It can never cease, till the question of slavery ceases to be a political question, in the organization of new Territories and new States.

It happened, also, that General Taylor, now President of the United States, although a Southern man and a slaveholder, did not favor the claims of Texas over New Mexico, and there was imminent danger of an armed collision between the State of Texas and the United States.

All these, and other difficulties arising out of these questions, were to be encountered in the resolutions of Compromise proposed by Mr. Clay. Although the third resolution defined the western boundary of Texas in coincidence with her claims, it gave her no part of New Mexico.

This feature of the resolution, brought Mr. Rusk, of Texas, at once to his feet, when Mr. Clay sat down, and he said:—

"I do not intend, Mr. President, to enter into this discussion [now?], and I rise simply for the purpose of saying that I regret extremely that the distinguished senator from Kentucky, in his laudable desire to settle a very troublesome question, now agitating the people of the United States, should have seen proper, rather unceremoniously, as I think, to take one half of the territory of the State I have the honor, in part, here to represent, to make a peace-offering to a spirit of encroachment on the constitutional rights of one half of this Union. * * * Does not the honorable senator know that, appended to the treaty with Mexico, of which he speaks, signed and sealed by the Commissioners who negotiated it, and expressly made a part of the treaty, there is a map which defines all the territory east of the Rio Grande and to the 42d degree of north latitude, as Texas, and that the territory west of that river is expressly designated as New Mexico? The boundary thus defined is made a part of the treaty itself, and no fair interpretation can permit any body to assume a different one."

This map, doubtless, originated at Washington, and it may be regarded as part of the general plan. Since the Rio Grande was to be the boundary between the United States and Mexico, up to a certain point, it was of no consequence to Mexico under what jurisdiction the territory between the Rio Grande and the Nueces should fall. It was, therefore, no part of the treaty. It was known that Texas claimed to the Rio Grande, and the coloring of the map, as if Texas extended to that line, might have been accidental, or it might have been an arbitrary order from Washington. It is clear that Mexico had nothing to do with it, and that she could be no further interested than as a party in fixing the boundary line between herself and the United States. It is immaterial, therefore, whether the drawer of the map, as a matter of convenience, carried out Texas to the Rio Grande, not knowing what other disposition to make of that territory, or whether he had his orders for a future political purpose, Mexico,

as a party to the treaty, could have had no voice in it, as it could not have been a matter of treaty stipulation.

Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, also rose, to protest against the 5th and 6th resolutions, as implying that Congress had power to legislate on slavery in the District of Columbia; and he did not agree with Mr. Clay that "slavery does not now exist by law in any of the territory acquired from Mexico;" nor that it was expedient for Congress to make any declaration on that point; nor in the proposed boundaries of Texas; nor in assuming the debt of Texas, in the manner proposed; although he did approve of the proposal to enact an efficient law for the recovery of fugitive slaves, and would not object to the admission of California, as a free State into the Union, if, at the same time, another slave State could be set off from Texas.

Although Mr. Clay had expressed the hope, that no debate would arise on his proposed resolutions at this time, he felt obliged to say a few words in reply to Mr. Rusk and Mr. Foote, which he did, but which we do not think it necessary to cite.

Mr. Mason, of Virginia, could assent to only one of the propositions of Mr. Clay, which is embodied in the second part of the second resolution, regarding the organization of Territorial governments. From all the rest he dissented; and he spoke somewhat at length in a statement of his views. He would accept of nothing less than the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific. So also Mr. Foote.

Mr. Clay said: "I am reminded of my coming from a slave State. I tell the senator from Mississippi [Mr. Foote], and I tell the senator from Virginia [Mr. Mason], that I know my duty, and that I mean to express the opinions I entertain fearless of all mankind. * * * And now, sir, coming from a slave State as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of slavery where it had not before existed, either south or north of the Missouri Compromise line. Coming as I do from a slave State, it is my solemn, deliberate, and well-matured determination that no power, no earthly power, shall compel me to vote for the positive introduction of slavery, either south or north of that line. Sir, while you reproach, and justly too, our British ancestors for the introduction of this institution upon the continent of America, I am, for one, unwilling that the posterity of the present inhabitants

of California or New Mexico shall reproach us for doing just what we reproach Great Britain for doing to us. If the citizens of those Territories choose to establish slavery, and if they come here with constitutions establishing slavery, I am for admitting them with such provisions in their constitutions; but then it will be their own work and not ours; and their posterity will have to reproach them and not us, for forming constitutions allowing the institution of slavery to exist among them. These are my views, sir, and I choose to express them; and I care not how extensively or universally they are known."

Mr. Davis of Mississippi, Mr. Downs of Louisiana, Mr. Berrien of Georgia, and Mr. Butler of South Carolina, declared themselves not satisfied with Mr. Clay's resolutions. Mr. Davis thought it was no compromise at all, as the concessions required, he said, were all on the part of the South, and none from the North; and this seemed to be the general feeling of Senators from the slaveholding States. There was, therefore, in the outset, but little promise of the final adoption of Mr. Clay's resolutions in their original form. They were made the special order of the day for the Tuesday following.

As may be supposed, the Senate chamber, on this occasion, was thronged with spectators, to hear Mr. Clay's resolutions propounded, and his accompanying remarks upon them. It was unexpected that so much of a debate should have arisen that day; but many senators from the South claimed that their dissent should go forth to the public in company with the publication of Mr. Clay's plan of compromise.

CHAPTER VII.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

Review of Mr. Clay's great Speech on his Compromise Resolutions.—Mr. Clay's Project for the gradual Abolition of Slavery in the State of Kentucky.—Extract from Mr. Clay's Will.

We know not how we can better commence this chapter than by the following letter, and the introductory remarks of the *Albany Register* of August 6, 1852, in which the letter was first published:

"The letter of the Rev. Dr. Van Arsdale to Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, which we have the privilege of publishing this morning, will be read with the deepest interest by all the friends of the great departed patriot. It adds to the long catalogue another glorious illustration of the noble disinterestedness which actuated his mighty heart whenever it was moved for the Republic which he loved so devotedly and adorned so brightly. It displays the self-sacrificing spirit of the true patriot, at a moment at once the most interesting in his long life of invaluable public services, and one of the most critical in the history of the country. If any thing could add to the imperishable fame of Henry Clay, or more firmly attach the grateful hearts of his countrymen to his memory, it is the episode in his life which Mr. Van Arsdale so graphically relates, and which sheds a bright ray upon his brilliantly-illuminated descent to the grave which has just closed over him."

"FROM THE REV. DR. VAN ARSDALE TO THE HON. THEODORE FRELINGHUYSEN.

"MANOR HOUSE, ALBANY, August 2, 1852.

"HON. AND DEAR SIR—In reading your eulogy of our lamented Mr. Clay, which has just met my attention, I observed the following sentence in relation to his last great effort for the country he so truly loved—the effort in which he brought forth his celebrated

Compromise measures—measures which are now substantially incorporated into the platform of both the prominent political parties—and which, under a kind Providence, were the means of adjusting difficulties and healing sectional strifes that seriously threatened to disturb our national peace, if not to break up the Union itself.

"You justly remark: 'In the good Providence of God, Mr. Clay was again called to soothe irritations and persuade to reconcilement the councils of Congress, and through them the American people. God crowned his labors with prosperity. He was spared to rejoice in the privilege and honor of a third glorious achievement—the triumph of fraternal good will over the angry passions of our fallen nature, and the Union lives again in its strength to cherish and animate the hopes of the world. AND HAVING FULFILLED THIS DUTY OF ANXIOUS AND WEARING TOIL FOR HIS COUNTRY, THE HONORED PATRIOT LAID DOWN TO DIE, AND PRECIOUS WILL BE HIS MEMORY TO THE END OF TIME.'

"Now, sir, there was an incident connected with that last great effort of Mr. Clay—the delivery of his Compromise speech—with which I only am acquainted, and which strikingly illustrates the truth of your statement, and the purity and strength of his patriotism. On the morning when he commenced that speech, so highly serviceable to our country's good, I walked with him from his lodgings at the National Hotel to the Senate Chamber. He was suffering, as he said, with a severe cold, and was very feeble. As we came to the long flight of steps at the Capitol, he said: 'Will you lend me your arm, my friend; for I find myself quite weak and exhausted this morning?' Of course I gave him my arm, and we commenced the ascent. Every few steps, however, we were obliged to stop for him to take breath, and he also coughed severely. We went round by the back way, as he said it was less fatiguing to him. He had told me that he intended to speak that morning on that subject; but when we arrived at the Senate Chamber, finding him so much indisposed, I said: 'Mr. Clay, had you not better defer your speech? You are certainly too ill to exert yourself to-day.' 'My dear friend,' he replied, '*I consider our country in danger, and if I can be the means in any measure of averting that danger, my health or life is of little consequence.*'

"Such was the spirit of this noble-minded, this Christian patriot! When we entered the Senate Chamber it was already crowded with spectators, both ladies and gentlemen; for it was known that Mr. Clay was to speak. After the preliminary exercises of the morning, he arose in his place and commenced his address. Those who were present will remember that when he began it was very evident that he was not well, and they will also remember how soon his majestic and patriotic spirit kindled into burning eloquence, and rose above the infirmities of his

body, as he spoke of the dangers which threatened the perpetuity of the Union; they will remember how his lips quivered and his thrilling voice faltered with the generous emotions of a devoted Christian patriot, when he said that, having first borne that subject on his heart before God 'in his chamber,' he now came to present it to the Senate. For two days he continued to occupy the floor, and chained the attention of his numerous and admiring auditors. Those who had often heard him in the meridian of his strength, told me that he had never spoken with greater energy, both of thought and manner. Included in his devotion to God, was his devotion to his country. Every faculty was absorbed with, and every power consecrated to its welfare. His object was gained. Harmony was restored. The country was saved. But the manly form of the noble statesman sank beneath the mighty effort which his patriotism inspired, and it now sleeps with the dead. When his corpse arrived in Philadelphia, in a brief conversation with some of the committee of the Senate who were attending it to its place of rest, General Cass remarked to me, that '*Mr. Clay never recovered from the effect of the exertion he then made, and he had no doubt it had hastened his death.*' Yet, with reason himself to apprehend such would be the effect, Mr. Clay put forth his mightiest effort to preserve the Union; and thus closed his long and brilliant career by *sacrificing himself to his country.* He forgot himself in his greater love for his native land. This was true patriotism. Well then may all parties mourn his loss, and hold 'his memory precious to the end of time.'

"As an additional tribute to this great and good man, whom it has been my privilege for several years past to know well and sincerely to love, and as revealing with an additional ray of light that example so worthy of all imitation, I have been induced to relate the above incident. "C. CORNELL VAN ARSDALE."

It was the sixth of February, 1850, when the Rev. Dr. Van Arsdale accompanied Mr. Clay to the Senate Chamber, as above described, and when he commenced that great speech of two days, on the resolutions of Compromise, presented by him on the 29th of January, 1850, as set forth in the preceding chapter. His state of health is mournfully depicted in the letter above cited. One can easily see that he was altogether too feeble to undertake such a mighty effort. He could not mount the steps of the Capitol without leaning on the arm of the Reverend Doctor, and stopping to rest. His great heart and lofty mind had communed with his Maker, and laid the theme of this and the next day's discourse before the throne of heaven. For his exordium opens thus:

"Mr. President—Never, on any former occasion, have I risen under feelings of such painful solicitude. I have seen many periods of great anxiety, peril, and of danger, in this country; but I have never before risen to address any assemblage so oppressed, so appalled, and so anxious. And, sir, I hope it will not be out of place to do here what again and again I have done in my private chamber, to implore of Him who holds the destinies of nations and of individuals in his hands to bestow upon our country his blessing, to calm the violence and rage of party, to still passion, to allow reason once more to resume its empire. And may I not ask of Him, too, sir, to bestow on his humble servant now before Him, the blessing of his smiles, and of strength and ability to perform the work that now lies before him?"

This speech will be found entire in the Appendix,* to which the reader is not only referred, but he is recommended to peruse it before he takes up the review of it contained in this chapter. Though long (it occupied two full days in its delivery), it occupies too important a part of Mr. Clay's history at this period, not to be put down as a portion of it. It was his last great public effort, though he afterward mingled somewhat in the debates of the Senate. The influence which it had on the great pacification that followed before this session of Congress had come to a close, is undisputed, although Mr. Clay's resolutions were not in form adopted. While the subject was in debate, on the 14th of February, Mr. Clay said:

"My idea was, if the Senate should think proper finally to decide affirmatively on these resolutions, that we should then refer them to appropriate committees, either one resolution by itself to an appropriate committee, or combining two or three together, according to the affinity of the subjects they embrace, and let the committee act on these two or three subjects. But I never did contemplate embracing in the entire scheme of accommodation and harmony which I proposed, all these distracting questions, and bringing them all into one measure."

His resolutions and his vindication of them, set the ball in motion, which rolled on to the accomplishment of a great result. It was impossible to stop, and equally impossible to evade the great questions which Mr. Clay had started. His resolutions might and did encounter opposition, and they were not affirmed by the Senate, as Mr. Clay hoped they would be. But they

* Appendix, A page 301.

were there in a palpable and unmistakable form, and they were aimed directly at the actual state of the country, so that their bearings could not be misinterpreted. The purity and patriotism of Mr. Clay's motives in this movement were highly appreciated, and frequently acknowledged by his political opponents. Indeed he scarcely had an opponent, except of his resolutions. So fully were all impressed with the patriotic aims of Mr. Clay, that they rendered involuntary homage to his heart. It was seen and felt that nothing but a love of country could have induced him to expose himself to such a sacrifice, in making such an effort in such a state of health. His devout exordium made its appeal and had its influence, as no man living suspected Mr. Clay of religious insincerity. It was unexpected, doubtless; but every one felt how appropriate it was. It required no small degree of religious bravery to do a thing so rare in such circumstances. There again was the man. It was Mr. Clay, who feared not man, but who then professed to fear God, and to believe in him. With so little fear of man, it was no great virtue in Mr. Clay to break forth in such aspirations, except as they came from the profoundest convictions and sentiments of his heart, as no one doubted they did. It was, therefore, so much more effective.

Mr. Clay attributed the unhappy state of the country to the violence of party spirit, and deprecated it in the most feeling manner. "Mr. President, it is passion, passion—party, party, and intemperance—that is all I dread in the adjustment of the great questions which unhappily at this time divide our distracted country." He considered the question of slavery, as it divided the North from the South, most difficult of adjustment. Hence all his studies and efforts were directed to that. As will be seen, each one of his eight resolutions had an aspect in that direction, except the first.

California had already organized as a State, fixed her own boundaries, and put her State machinery in operation—an irregularity doubtless—for according to fundamental law she was nothing more than a part of the territory of the United States, and subject to Federal law as such. She could not regularly move to an organization as a State without the consent and under the direction of a law of Congress. But, conscious of her physical and political position on the Pacific coast, of her sudden and rapid growth to power and importance, and relying

on her prospective resources as the land of gold, she put on the airs of dictating the terms on which she would become a State of the Union, rather than of asking leave to join the family, and to be regularly inaugurated. It was a natural thought of the time and circumstances, both to the Californians and to the Federal Government, that if not humored in the attitude she had assumed, California might become the head of a western confederacy, bounded on the east by the backbone of the Continent, on the north by the British provinces, and destined to absorb Mexico on the south. This dream had doubtless already entertained the imaginations of California political aspirants, and the thought was, doubtless, a sufficient admonition to the Federal authorities to wink at these irregularities in the formation of the State Government of California. The attitude of California —though not declared as such, was: "Take us in or not as you please; we have nothing to ask as a favor." This, undoubtedly, was the position and temper of California at this moment, and it was a matter for Congress to decide upon at this session.

But to those who had made the war with Mexico, it was not only a great disappointment, but, so far, a complete subversion of their plans, if Mr. Clay's interpretation of it in his *Raleigh Letter* was correct, viz., that the war was made for the extension of slavery. California, by her constitution, had excluded slavery, and she presented herself to Congress, not in the attitude of supplication, to be permitted to organize as a State, but as an independent State already organized. By her admission, without at the same time admitting a slave State, the balance of power in the Senate of the United States, where alone it can be maintained, as between the free and slave States, would be turned in favor of the free States; as the latter, in that case, would be one State in the majority in that body. In the House of Representatives, it was well known that the free States were always in the majority. It seemed, therefore, to be a crisis. You must admit California, with all her unbecoming airs, and with all this irregularity, or have a western confederacy; then, perhaps, a civil war; and a civil war in all probability could only end in a western confederacy.

Mr. Clay, therefore, in his anxious endeavor, was obliged to encounter the aspects of this state of things. Nothing was more evident than that California must be treated with respect, and her demand, in substance, acceded to. This was the point of

the first resolution, leaving the exact boundaries of the State of California as an open question. All that Mr. Clay desired by this and the other resolutions, was the determination of principles, not of the details of their application. He did not pretend to bring in a bill or bills as projects of law. He only wanted the affirmation of certain principles which he thought the exigences of the country demanded, and which could afterward be incorporated in the forms of law, as the cases might require, in separate bills adapted to the several cases.

It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose, as some have hastily done, that Mr. Clay's resolutions on this occasion were a failure, because they were not immediately and specifically affirmed and adopted. The resolutions were entering wedges, the power of which, driven by Mr. Clay's hand, could not be evaded. The then session of Congress could not and did not rise till they were substantially disposed of. They might and did occupy a long time for debate; they might and did appear in different forms; but there was no escape from them. Only one of them, the second, failed to be acted upon definitely during this session; and the reason of that we shall see by and by. Mr. Clay, therefore, stands in history as the prime mover of the great pacification of 1850. No one, therefore, can claim to understand that important part of the history of this country who has not attentively read those resolutions of Mr. Clay and his introductory remarks, as found in the preceding chapter, in connection with his great speech on those resolutions, as found in the appendix to this volume. These together constitute the last great effort of Mr. Clay's public life.

The admission of California as a State was naturally the first topic, and one which could in no way be evaded. It was, indeed, a sore disappointment to those who had brought on the Mexican war for the extension of slavery, to find the first State formed out of the territory acquired, herself of vast dimensions, vigorous, increasing in population beyond example, her soil and mountains rich in gold, and well adapted to agriculture, excluding slavery from her fundamental law! And that the admission of California into the Union, which must be done at this time or never, should destroy the balance of power between the slave and free States, in favor of the latter, in the Senate of the United States, was another stupendous political result, not less astounding to the slave propagandists!

Having disposed of the first resolution, regarding the admission of California, Mr. Clay passed to the second, which was in substance,* that slavery had been abolished in the Republic of Mexico, and that consequently, on the principles of public law, the territory acquired from Mexico by the United States, was free territory. On the recognition of this great fact, Mr. Clay proposed, as a compromise between the North and South, that territorial governments should be established by Congress over this broad field, "without any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery," and leave that question with the people, when States should be formed out of those territories. It can not but be seen, however, that the recognition of this great and broad principle, that the territories acquired from Mexico were free, in consequence of the abolition of slavery by the Republic of Mexico, gave the advantage to freedom as opposed to the system of slavery: inasmuch as the normal condition of those territories was that they were free, and that slavery could never be established in them, till it should be done by the fundamental law of a State, or by Congress, which last was not likely to be done.

It is to be noticed, also, that Mr. Clay proposed to declare in this resolution, that slavery "is not likely to be introduced into the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico," and that he makes this an important point in his speech. On the basis of these "two truths,"as he thought himself entitled to call them, to wit, that "slavery does not exist by law" in the acquired territory, and that it is not likely to be introduced there—the first of which certainly was a fact, though the latter was hypothetical—Mr. Clay appeals to the representatives of the free States, as a concession to the South, to abandon the principle of the Wilmot proviso, as being of no avail, even if it could be carried. That proviso, it will be remembered, aimed to legislate definitively against the introduction of slavery in any of the territories acquired from Mexico, and it was carried in the House of Representatives, by a decisive majority, when President Polk called upon Congress for $3,000,000, with which to make a peace with Mexico; but the proviso failed in the Senate. The principle of this proviso took a strong hold of the public mind in the free States.

* See the resolution, page 115.

"What do you, who reside in the free States, want?" said Mr. Clay. "You want that there shall be no slavery introduced into the territories acquired from Mexico. Well, have you not got it in California already, if admitted as a State? Have you not got it also in New Mexico, in all human probability? What more do you want? You have got what is worth a thousand Wilmot provisos. You have got nature itself on your side. You have the fact itself on your side. You have the truth staring you in the face, that no slavery is existing there. Well, if you are men, if you can rise from the mud and slough of party struggles, and elevate yourselves to the height of patriots, what will you do? You will look at the fact as it exists."

In Mr. Clay's mind and feelings, there was a fair compromise between the North and South, in this resolution. It declares that slavery does not exist by law in the acquired territories, and that nature forbids its being introduced there. The first part of Mr. Clay's second resolution is, as will be seen, the declaration of a fact, determined by the principles of Public Law, to which Mr. Clay, no doubt, gave the true interpretation. But as it depended on interpretation, it could hardly have more force than an opinion. The second declaration, that slavery was not likely to be introduced in those territories, was also a matter of opinion, which Mr. Webster afterward, in his seventh of March speech, uttered with great force. The South was not prepared to affirm either of these declarations, and the North did not confide in them. The South objected to the doctrine of the first declaration, and the North would not trust to either, but demanded the Wilmot proviso. Hence this resolution failed. But it was a sufficient triumph for Mr. Clay that the principle of each of his resolutions was incorporated in subsequent legislation.

Nevertheless, the second resolution, as a matter of record, in the place which it occupies in history, as having been proposed by Mr. Clay on this occasion, has had, and will ever have, about the same effect which would have followed from its affirmation by the Senate of the United States. It announced a great principle of far higher authority than that of the United States Senate —a principle of Public Law—a principle which will be recognized by all mankind, and which can not ultimately fail of its effect in the specific application which Mr. Clay proposed to make of it. It is a historical fact, that the Republic of Mexico had abolished slavery, and that when peace was concluded between the United States and Mexico, slavery did not exist in the

territories acquired by the United States, consequently, slavery can not go there, except as established in the fundamental law of a new State, or by a special act of Congress, the latter of which will not, in any human probability, ever be perpetrated. In theory, however, though not with a view to a practical application, Mr. Clay asserts the principle, that the general and unlimited power over the territories of the United States giver. to Congress by the Constitution, comprehends that of establishing slavery in the territories. Hence the power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, to retain, or modify, or abolish it at discretion. Mr. Clay thinks that the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the territories, implies the power to establish it, and that the two powers are necessarily co-existent.

Mr. Clay had occasion to expose the absurdity of the doctrine, that the Constitution of the United States carries the right to hold slaves along with it into the territories. "Why," said Mr. Clay, "these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them there is slavery, and in fifteen of them slavery does not exist. Well, how can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carry into the ceded territory their institution of slavery, any more than it can be argued, on the other side, that by the operation of the same Constitution, the fifteen free States carry into the ceded territory the principle of freedom, which they from policy have chosen to adopt within their limits? * * * Is there not just as much ground to contend, that where a moiety of the States is free, and the other moiety is slaveholding, the principle of freedom which prevails in one class, shall operate as much as the principle of slavery which prevails in the other? Can you come to any other conclusion than that which I understand to be the conclusion of the Public Law of the world, of reason, and justice, that the *status* of law, as it existed in the moment of conquest or the acquisition, remains until it is altered by the sovereign authority of the conquering or acquiring power? That is the great principle which you can scarcely turn over a page of the Public Law of the world without finding recognized, and every where established."

Nevertheless, there is a specious argument of the slaveholder. He says he is a citizen of the United States, and has a right to his property any where. As an abstract proposition, this would seem to be clear and undeniable. But it is already decided by

the common law of the civilized world, that if he carries his slave into a free State, that slave is free. This question, therefore, is not debatable, but it is settled forever. But the slaveholder says, he can take his slave into any territory of the United States, and hold him as property under the Federal Constitution. But the Federal Constitution recognizes slavery only in the slave States. There is no law, therefore, Federal or municipal, that will protect the property of a slaveholder in his slave, in any territory of the United States, except in the District of Columbia. The reason is obvious. Slavery is not the creature of Federal laws, nor of the Federal Constitution; neither can it be created by territorial laws; but only by the fundamental law of a State; and its protection as property can only be secured by the municipal regulations of slave States. Slave property, in the United States certainly, is exceptional. It is not property every where, in free States, for example, except the slave be a fugitive, and there is no law by which a slave can be held as property in any of the territories of the United States, except in the District of Columbia. Where is the law? It can not be found. The Federal Constitution and laws recognize slave property in slave States, and in the District of Columbia; but nowhere else.* The slaveholder may, doubtless, carry his slave property into the territories; but he does it at his own risk. There is no law there, or elsewhere, which he can invoke to protect it. The slaveholder may say, and he doubtless feels, that this is unjust. But if he looks at the subject, apart from his interest in the question, he must see that we have laid down the rule correctly.

The sum of the matter is, that property in man, such as slave property, is against the opinion and sentiments of mankind, and against the genius of all free institutions. The common law of England, as promulged in the famous Somerset case, and which has been adopted by the free States of America—adopted, indeed, by the civilized world—has decided against the holding of property in man, such as slave property; and such property can only be held under special regulations, such as exist in the United States, and that only for the limited jurisdictions specified. Outside of those jurisdictions, there is, and can be, no property in man, except he be a fugitive slave. Freedom, as opposed to property in man, is the rule—is common law—and slavery is the exception. Slavery can only exist under special regulations;

* The law of 1854, changes the case.

as, on account of the peculiar circumstances in which slavery was introduced and found here, when the Federal compact was formed, it was made a special case, and placed under exceptional rules, which apply to no other species of property. Consequently, these exceptional regulations can only be invoked for the protection of slave property where that property is recognized as such. All must see that the Federal Constitution does not recognize slave property, except when the fundamental law of States and their municipal regulations have established it. Consequently, Federal power can not be invoked to protect such property, except when it exists under the *municipal* laws of particular States. He who owns slaves, or chooses to be connected with slavery, occupies this position with a full knowledge of the fact that his slave property is not property every where; and it is his own fault if he does not comprehend all the exceptions of the case, one of which is, that he can no more hold a slave as property in any of the Territories of the United States, except in the District of Columbia, than in one of the free States. Where is the law by which he can hold such property, in such a place? There is none. In vain will he invoke Federal power: for it does not apply to the case. In vain will he invoke the authorities of the slave State from which he emigrated; for her authority extends not beyond her own jurisdiction. He may, perhaps, hold and control this species of property by sufferance, or by the ignorance of those around him; but there is no other tenure.

The position of slave property in the United States is a very simple one, and it never ought to occasion a moment's debate. Its guaranty is special, not common. It is an exceptional case of property held under a special tenure. We have only to ascertain the rules of the case, and it is all before us. What are those rules? In the first place, the Federal Constitution recognizes the right, in the original slave States, to the institution of slavery, and the right to regulate it. Next, the slave States are allowed to count their slaves five for three, to be represented in Congress. Thirdly, the slave States are entitled to the protection of the Federal Government, in case of a slave insurrection. And fourthly, the slave States are entitled to the aid of the Federal Government for the recovery of fugitive slaves. All the slave States admitted into the Union, have been placed on the same footing. These four items comprehend all the law there is on the subject of slavery, so far as the General Government is con-

cerned. All the rest is left with the municipal regulations of the slave States. And surely it can hardly require any great stretch of the human faculties to comprehend this.

The position of slavery in the United States, in relation to general society, is very like that of the federal Constitution in relation to the sovereignty of the States. In the latter case, whatever powers are not delegated to the General Government by the Constitution, are reserved to the States. The General Government can exercise no other than its delegated powers. In the same manner, the institution of slavery in the United States, can claim no more than the special grants made to it. All other powers belong to general society. The institution of slavery is exceptional, and its rights are specific, not general. Nothing can be claimed for it but that which is specifically granted. It is enough for the slaveholding States, and all they ask, we suppose, that they are sovereign in their respective jurisdictions, and that no power, foreign to themselves, has a right to interfere with their municipal regulations on the subject of slavery.

Of course, Mr. Clay is not to be regarded as responsible for the thoughts above recorded on this subject, although they are naturally suggested by his argument. As will be seen by reading his speech in the appendix, he came broadly on the ground of the position occupied by slavery in general society, and if we mistake not, he has defined it substantially as we have, in his argument on the second resolution, though not in like terms and phraseologies. We have aimed to show, that the normal condition of American society is freedom as opposed to a system of slavery, and that a system of slavery is exceptional. We think this is Mr. Clay's doctrine. But Mr. Clay intended to be fair to the slave States, on the ground of the Federal Constitution. He would defend and vindicate their rights, as secured by that instrument, even by the sword as a last resort, as he says in his speech. But he would not surrender the great principle, that freedom as opposed to property in man, is the normal condition of civilized society, more especially of American society.

On the third and fourth resolutions, which relate to the western and northern boundaries of Texas, and the compensation to be given to Texas for a surrender of a portion of her territorial claims, the argument of Mr. Clay will well repay an attentive perusal. These resolutions were alike a compromise between

the North and South, and between the United States and Texas —between the two former parties, as on the principles of the second resolution, the boundaries specified conceded less to freedom than the North demanded, and less to slavery than the South demanded; and between the United States and Texas, as an ample compensation to Texas for the surrender of a portion of her claim, was contemplated, and which afterward, on motion of Mr. Clay, was fixed at $10,000,000, of which $5,000,000 were to be appropriated to the payment of the debts of Texas. This grant was largely in excess of the estimate of the Texas senators, for filling out the blank, which they said could not be less than $3,000,000. But Mr. Clay not only desired to make Texas a liberal offer, but to secure a cheerful acceptance of it. Texas, with all her debts assumed by the United States, with at least $5,000,000 in her treasury, and with a broad public domain of great value, constantly augmenting, may be regarded in consequence of this arrangement, as perhaps the richest State in the Union. The aim of the third and fourth resolutions, therefore, was a compromise all round the circle of parties concerned in it, and in substance it finally prevailed.

At the close of Mr. Clay's remarks on the third and fourth resolutions, it was observed that his strength was very much exhausted, and on motion of Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, the Senate adjourned to the next day.

February the 6th, Mr. Clay resumed his speech with the following exordium: "Mr. President, if there be in this vast assembly of beauty, grace, elegance, and intelligence, any who have come here under the expectation that the humble individual who now addresses you means to attempt any display, any use of ambitious language, any extraordinary ornament or decoration of speech, they will be utterly disappointed. The season of the year, and my own season of life, both admonish me to abstain from any such ornaments; and above all, Mr. President, the awful subject upon which it is my duty to address the Senate and the country, forbids my saying any thing but what pertains strictly to that subject, and my sole desire is to make myself in seriousness, soberness, and plainness, understood by you, and by those who think proper to listen to me."

Although modesty is always an accompaniment of true greatness, it was quite unnecessary for Mr. Clay to make an apology for his plainness of speech. It was never by ornate diction that

Mr. Clay excited admiration, for he never attempted it. It was the man as known in all history, his fame, his sincerity in which every one believed, his deep convictions so eloquently betrayed whenever he rose to speak, his perfect mastery of language to express his thoughts, his personal dignity so impressive and commanding, his deferential manner so natural to him, his manly attitudes, the naturalness and pertinency of his action whenever he employed any, the grace and elegance of the *tout ensemble* of his manner, and withal, at this time, the weight of years that pressed upon him—these all constituted the charm, of which he himself was totally unconscious, that held a listening Senate, and a vast and variegated audience captive to his simple, but great endeavor.

After occupying a few moments in some remarks explanatory of a part of his argument the day before, Mr. Clay proceeded to the consideration of his fifth resolution, regarding slavery in the District of Columbia, where again he was forced to encounter a strong Southern and a strong Northern feeling. The resolution, as will be seen, consists of three parts, "that it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, while that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of that State, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District." The object of this resolution was twofold, first, to set at rest agitation in the free States on the subject of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia; and next, to prepare the way for the sixth resolution, which contemplated the abolition of the slave-trade in the District. Further, it may also be said that the fifth resolution contemplated a mutual concession from the North and South, as the latter would not allow that Congress had the power to abolish slavery in the District, while the former not only advocated the power, but was constantly pouring in petitions for Congress to exercise it.

When this resolution was first read on the 29th of January, the South started to its feet immediately, and demanded that the word "unconstitutional" should be substituted for "inexpedient," etc. This brought Mr. Clay out flat on the question of constitutional power: "I said the other day, as I have uniformly maintained in this body, as I contended in 1838, and ever have done, that the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia has been vested in Congress by language too clear and explicit

to admit, in my judgment, of any rational doubt whatever: 'To exercise *exclusive* jurisdiction, *in all cases whatsoever*, over the District,' etc. Now, sir, Congress, by this grant of power, is invested with all legislation *whatsoever* over the District, and not only so, but it is an *exclusive* power." Suppose, said Mr. Clay (we abridge his argument on this point), that Maryland should abolish slavery, are we obliged to have it forever in the District? Suppose Maryland and Virginia should abolish slavery, must we still have it in the District, because, forsooth, it is unconstitutional to abolish it? Suppose all the slave States should abolish slavery, must it remain forever a stain on our national escutcheon in the District of Columbia? Such is the absurdity of the position of those honorable senators, who maintain that the abolition of slavery in the District, by Congress, would be an unconstitutional act.

Mr. Clay expressed his astonishment, as justly he might, that honorable senators should take such ground, and he was forced to ascribe it to party spirit and passion. What else could it be? There was the language of the Constitution, and such was the absurdity, above depicted, of a denial of this power. Mr. Clay's fairness, as a logician, had previously admitted, in favor of the South, that Congress had power to establish slavery in the Territories, if they should think best. He also maintained that they had power to abolish slavery in the Territories, and that the two powers were necessarily co-existent.

But, in the case of the District of Columbia, there was an implied obligation in its cession by Maryland (also of Virginia before the retrocession) as a seat of the General Government, that the institutions of Maryland should not be injured by the use of it. It was an absolute cession for a specific object; but the abolition question, as it had sprung up in later times, was never anticipated. Mr. Clay, therefore, proposed that good faith with Maryland should be kept sacred, and that slavery in the District should not be abolished without her consent, as she had never contemplated such a result from her act of cession. The cession by Maryland was a patriotic donation, to found a seat of Federal power for the convenience and honor of the nation. And in good faith, Mr. Clay considered that Congress, though it had full and exclusive power of legislation over the District, could not depart from the great object of the cession, or go beyond it, for a political or other purpose, without consulting the generous donor; more especially,

that Congress could not in good faith, do any thing in the District that would disturb the institutions of Maryland, such as abolishing slavery there before Maryland had abolished it.

Notwithstanding Mr. Clay seemed to think, that this resolution demanded no concession from the North but sentiment, with great respect for his opinion, we think that principle was concerned in it, because, as must be seen, in affirming such a resolution as an act of Congress, so far as the free States should vote for it, they would not only loan their sanction to slavery in the District, but they would commit themselves by a direct act, to legislate for it there. All that could justly be claimed of the free States, in the case, was, that on account of their principles on the subject of slavery, they would not, in the circumstances, attempt to disturb slavery in the District, which would be a concession to the pacific object of the resolution, without committing them to uphold slavery. They not only believed with Mr. Clay, that Congress had the power to abolish slavery in the District, but they had serious scruples about its existence on the soil consecrated as the seat of the General Government; and the constituencies of the members of Congress from the free States, were constantly urging them to propose and effect the abolition of slavery in the District. This great and comprehensive fact was, indeed, the very occasion and ground of Mr. Clay's resolution; and we respectfully think that there was something more than sentiment, that there was principle in it. Mr. Clay elsewhere avers:

"I said yesterday there was not a single resolution, except the first (which called for no concession from either party), that did not either contain some mutual concession by the two parties, *or that did not contain concessions altogether from the North to the South.*"

We respectfully think that the fifth resolution is one of the latter class above referred to, unless it was claimed, as it hardly could be, that the use of the word "inexpedient" instead of the word "unconstitutional," was a concession from the South.

Mr. Clay was, doubtless, right in saying that his resolutions, as a whole, demanded more concessions from the North than from the South, and he purposely made them so. No man knew better than he how the South felt, and he had more hope of gaining concession from the North in his system of mutual

accommodation, because the people of the North knew that they themselves were safe, and Mr. Clay thought they could better afford concession. And while Mr. Clay, in his system of general compromises, placed much hope on the generosity of the North, on account of its secure position, he knew how to sympathize with the South on account of its conscious insecurity. He repeatedly told the senators from the free States, "It is sentiment with you. With us it is our homes, our wives, our families, our firesides." It can not be denied that these few words make a great speech, and a powerful appeal, and no man knew better how to apply such facts and thoughts than Mr. Clay, and there was a great deal of truth in them. Nevertheless, there must be a compromise, there must be concession from both sides, or else the great object of Mr. Clay in pacifying both parties would be frustrated. The North must give up something of its sentiment, though, as can not be denied, it clung very closely to principle in regard to slavery in the District of Columbia, as also on other questions; and the South must give up something of its unreasonable claims, as for example, that for Congress to legislate over slavery in the District of Columbia was unconstitutional; or that the Constitution of the United States carried it into all the Territories, and was bound to protect it there, independent of municipal law. These were points which the free States would never concede. It was necessary to Mr. Clay's general argument that he should maintain that Congress had unlimited power over the Territories, before they were erected into States; and, of course, power either to establish or abolish slavery there, though he himself would oppose the establishment of slavery in the Territories. He did not believe in slavery as a good and desirable institution, but he considered it a great evil. On this point he was an old-school statesman, as well as a friend of freedom. He said, we justly reproached our British ancestors for forcing slavery on this country against the remonstrances of the colonists, and that this fact was our best and chief vindication for having slavery here. For himself, he would never fall under the same reproach of a future State of this Union, for imposing slavery upon it, by establishing it in any of our Territories.

Probably no man more desired the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, as the seat of the General Government, to wipe off such a stain from our national escutcheon, than Mr.

Clay, and he doubtless looked forward to the time when that could be done with the consent of Maryland, and by the inhabitants of the District, by paying the owners of the slaves emancipated. But he would never consent to break faith with Maryland, or with the inhabitants of the District, by forcing emancipation against the will of these parties. He would, therefore, do the best thing which the circumstances of the case allowed: he would break up the slave-trade in the District, and put an end to the national disgrace of slave pens on the soil consecrated as the seat of government of a great and free people—of the shocking paradox of presenting to the public eye of the world, in such a place, bands of manacled slaves driven through Pennsylvania avenue, and singing on their march, in derision of American pretensions to freedom, "Hail, Columbia!" Mr. Clay claimed that there could be but one sentiment, North or South, on this question, and that even slaveholders looked upon this species of traffic with no other feelings than those of disgust and abhorrence. He declared that slave-traders were banished from good society, even in slave States, by their vocation, such, even there, was the universal detestation of the traffic. The appeal made in the sixth resolution was effective, and the slave-trade is forever banished from the District of Columbia.

The seventh resolution is, "That more effectual provision ought to be made by law, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor in any State, who may escape into any other State or Territory of the Union." The article of the Constitution of the United States, alluded to in this resolution, reads thus: "That no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

There have been two interpretations of this article: one, that it is a mere basis of federal legislation to effect its object; and the other, that it is itself the law, and the only law intended. By the latter interpretation, the rule prescribed to the owner of a slave that has escaped into another State, is, catch him if you can, and recover him if you can, in the use of the agencies of the General Government, as they exist in relation to the municipal laws of the State into which the fugitive may have gone.

As federal law is paramount, it is presupposed that no municipal regulation can oppose the recovery of the fugitive. But a long course of experience had proved that this power, if not inoperative, was at least very inadequate to the object in view, Mr. Clay assumed that this article of the Constitution was a mere basis of legislation, and such, doubtless, is the true construction of all fundamental law. It is not legislation in detail, but authority for such legislation, as the case may require. To this point Mr. Clay's seventh resolution was directed. This article of fundamental law had failed in securing its object. To the North, Mr. Clay could say, There is the article of the Constitution—there is the authority. To the South he could say, My resolution proposes to make that article of fundamental law effective for your purposes. The North could not deny the authority, and the South was willing to have help. In a measure of this kind, Mr. Clay said he would go as far as the furthest; and he rebuked the opposition that had been manifested in the free States to the accomplishment of this object, by ranking it with what is technically called bad neighborhood—bad in disposition, and, in some cases, bad in the positive enactments of legislation; for some of the free States had put impediments in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves. This Mr. Clay averred to be an infraction of the Federal Constitution, and he claimed that it was a grievous wrong, of which the slave States had just cause of complaint. He claimed that slaveholders, traveling in the free States, ought to be permitted to take their servants along with them, without being molested, and without being exposed to having them seduced and taken from them.

It can not be denied that on the basis of good neighborhood between the States, this reasoning was conclusive. But the logic of politics is one thing, and the logic of the heart is another; and no reasoning can ever suppress the actings of the latter. It is an ineffaceable part of the instincts of the people of the free States to think that property in man, African or other, is a wrong, and no law can force them to assist in the recovery of fugitive slaves, nor to do other than connive at their escape. Of this Mr. Clay was quite aware. He, therefore, desired that a law should be enacted by Congress, which should arm the Federal authorities with full and effective powers to overtake and recover fugitive slaves, against all these disadvantages. Mr. Clay regarded such a law as a necessary peace-offering to the South, in this great contro-

versy between the free and slave States. There was the article of the Constitution in the plainest terms providing authority, and Mr. Clay invoked a corresponding legislation to give it effect.

Still, the great principle of common law, that a slave is free the moment his foot touches free soil by the consent of his master, was one which must not be invaded. It is a doctrine of the civilized world, and it will only become stronger in its influence as time advances. It was only the special legislation of the slave States, and the rights of slavery as defined by the Federal Constitution, that could be invoked for its protection. It was absolutely necessary in the construction of this law, to steer straight between Scylla and Charybdis, to avoid being dashed on the rocks of the one, or swallowed up by the other, that the safety of the ship could be secured. The article of the Constitution above referred to, was the pole star. There was sufficient authority for Federal action; but it could not enforce a corresponding legislation in the free States, nor control the will of the people of the free States. It was, therefore, only an experiment, which might or might not prove effectual for the purpose intended. It was a hard pill for the free States to swallow; but they did swallow it; and the beneficent design of Mr. Clay and his associates would probably have been entirely effected, but for the nefarious introduction and passage of the Nebraska-Kansas Bill. Could Mr. Clay have risen from his grave, and appeared in the Senate Chamber when the Nebraska-Kansas Bill was on its passage, its authors would have turned pale with fear, and their teeth would have chattered in cold horror, for their rash and reckless daring in bringing forward and advocating such a measure, and for the fearful responsibility that awaited them! The treason of Cataline, which occasioned the memorable exclamation of Cicero, "O tempora! O mores!" was far behind, in its crime and nefarious purpose, this great American treason to the American compromises of past history. For the former, when exposed, was remediable; whereas the latter is irremediable.

The eighth and last resolution proposed by Mr. Clay, was the following: "That Congress has no power to prohibit or obstruct the trade in slaves between the slaveholding States; but that the admission or exclusion of slaves brought from one into another of them depends exclusively upon their own particular laws."

This had ever been the practice of the slaveholding States

and Mr. Clay contended that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States had ratified the principle. But there is an article in the Federal Constitution, giving power to Congress to regulate trade between the States, which the genius of the free States naturally interpreted as authorizing Congress to legislate on the slave-trade between the slaveholding States, and to suppress it. Of course, Mr. Clay's eighth resolution, affirmed by Congress, would be, so far, a concession from the free States in favor of the slave States. Practically, the course of things on this question would, doubtless, remain the same as it had been, and the resolution, affirmed, would acquire no new ground, except to arrest agitation on the subject; and this was what Mr. Clay desired. As the slave States were very sensitive on this question, Mr. Clay wished to allay their apprehensions by a formal declaration of Congress, although he himself relied calmly on the decision of the Supreme Court, and on past usage. "I think," said Mr. Clay, "the decision of the Supreme Court has been founded upon correct principles, and I trust it will forever put an end to the question whether Congress has or has not the power to regulate the intercourse and trade in slaves between the different States."

"Such, Mr. President," said Mr. Clay, "is the series of resolutions which, in an earnest and anxious desire to present the olive-branch to both parts of this distracted, and, at the present moment, unhappy country, I have thought it my duty to offer. * * * While I was engaged in anxious consideration upon this subject, the idea of the Missouri Compromise, as it has been termed, came under my review, was considered by me, and finally rejected, as in my judgment less worthy of the common acceptance of both parts of this Union than the project which I have offered for your consideration."

It was then, is now generally, and seems ever destined to be understood, that Mr. Clay was the author of the compromise line of 36° 30′, adopted by Congress in 1820; whereas Mr. Clay had nothing to do with it. It did not originate in the House of which Mr. Clay was then a member, but in the Senate. Mr. Thomas, senator from Illinois, was the original proposer of this line. "You will find," says Mr. Clay, "if you will take the trouble to look at the journals, that on as many as three or four different occasions, Mr. Thomas in every instance presented the

proposition of 36° 30′. It was finally agreed to; and I take occasion to say, that among those who voted for this line, were the majority of the Southern members—my friend from Alabama (Mr. King), in the Senate, Mr. Pinckney, from Maryland, and, indeed, the majority of Southern senators voted for this line; and the majority of the Southern members in the other House, at the head of whom was Mr. Lowndes himself, voted for that line. I have no doubt I did also; but as I was speaker, the journal does not show. But I have no doubt that I voted, in common with my other Southern friends, for the adoption—in a spirit of compromise, it is true—of the line of 36° 30′."

The famous compromise, proposed and carried by Mr. Clay, in 1821, had nothing to do with the line of 36° 30′. This line of compromise was fixed, as above noticed, at the previous session of Congress, and Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, was its author. But at the next session of Congress, running into 1821, the country was all in a blaze again, when Missouri claimed to be admitted as a State, with a clause in her Constitution, excluding free blacks from her jurisdiction, which would shut out all citizens of free States who might be tainted with African blood. This, evidently, was in direct contravention of the Federal Constitution, which guaranties equal rights for the citizens of any State in all the other States. This was the great difficulty which Mr. Clay had to grapple with, when he returned to Congress in January, 1821, after some weeks of the session had expired, and when the flame of excitement in Congress and in the country was intense, on account of this attitude of Missouri, and this clause in her Constitution. Read the history of Mr. Clay's doings on this occasion, as given by himself in his speech in the appendix to this volume. That account will forever have a thrilling interest. It was one of the greatest achievements of man in the social state—all accomplished, unaided, by the genius, the skill, the tact, the patriotism of that wonderful man, so divinely endowed for great exigences. Nothing could be more simple than the proposal, the compromise, a copy of which will be found in the speech in the appendix. As will be seen, it was infallible in its aim—morally certain to accomplish its object in Missouri, if it could be carried through Congress. *Hoc opus, hic labor.* When Mr. Clay proposed his plan, all saw that he was inspired for the occasion, and that he was the only man to do it. With the most rare unanimity, with scarcely a breath of opposi-

tion, both Houses of Congress let him have his own way entirely AND IT WAS DONE. Well might Mr. Clay be called the GREAT PACIFICATOR. The angry waves which at that moment rolled fearfully over the face of the whole country, were all stilled in a moment as by a charm. The flames of discord which flashed upon the clouds in a dark night, like a city in conflagration, were all extinguished by a single breath of Mr. Clay's mouth. For, after all, it was simply a breath—a word. It was simply saying to Missouri, "Yes, come in; be one of our great family; but come like a sister, acknowledging the paramount obligations of the Federal Constitution." This was all that was required; and it was morally certain that Missouri would come in on that condition, thus nullifying, by her own act, the obnoxious clause of her Constitution. She did come in, and all was peace. Nothing but a transcendent genius adapted to great exigences, and allied to a sound heart beating in every pulse with human kindness and patriotism, could have invented and applied so simple, so effective, so infallible a remedy for the agitations of that fearful hour. Read the compromise, as given in the speech, and observe its simplicity; and read Mr. Clay's own comments upon it. Is it not a marvel that such a simple invention could have produced such an effect? We say again, it was the creative power of genius, of consummate skill in human affairs.

We desire here to call attention to Mr. Clay's remarks in his speech on the Compromise Line, so called, of 36° 30′. It will be seen he does not think there is much virtue or fairness in it; certainly no reciprocity; but that it is all for one side in the great controversy. Nevertheless, Mr. Clay was sufficiently decided on the question of planting slavery in the Territories south of the line of 36° 30′. "Sir," he said, "I have said that I never could vote for it, and I repeat that I never can, and never will vote for it. No earthly power shall ever make me vote to plant slavery where slavery does not exist."

The concluding remarks of Mr. Clay, in his speech, after he had considered and vindicated his resolutions *seriatim*, are worthy of special attention. He was completely exhausted by his two days' effort, running into the night of each day, and the drooping powers of his physical condition, toward the close of the second day, were sufficiently apparent. His friends observing this exhaustion, repeatedly proposed an adjournment to the third day. But Mr. Clay, apparently conscious that he could not

attempt to speak another day, insisted on concluding at this time, though he could not say all he wished. It is an imperfect and unfinished peroration; but what there is of it is replete with the agony of concern which he felt for the country. Though he had afterward much to do in the disposition of these great questions, this was the end of his great effort of this session of Congress, and of his public life. It was too much for his strength, and it undoubtedly shortened his days, for he never recovered from its effects.

In connection with the great theme of this chapter, and as having an intimate affinity with it, we think it proper to notice Mr. Clay's letter, in 1849, on the gradual abolition of slavery in Kentucky, when a Convention of that State was about to alter and amend the Constitution. The letter is addressed to Richard Pindell, Esq., of Lexington; but, as will be seen, was intended for the people of the State. It proposes a system of gradual emancipation, till the State should be entirely rid of slavery. Although Mr. Clay had little hope of success at this time, he nevertheless thought it his duty to present and argue the question before the people of Kentucky, when they were about to make changes in their fundamental law. This letter is an important historical memento of a life-long cherished scheme of Mr. Clay, and it contains a detailed project of legislation for the accomplishment of this object. It demonstrates how much Mr. Clay had thought upon the subject, and that he had well considered all the practical operations of the question. The letter will be found in the Appendix to this volume.*

The following extract from the last will and testament of Mr. Clay, regarding the disposition of his own slaves, is based on the same principles which he proposed for the gradual abolition of slavery in the State of Kentucky:

EXTRACT FROM MR. CLAY'S WILL.

"In the sale of any of my slaves, I direct that members of families shall not be separated without their consent.

"My will is, and I accordingly direct, that the issue of all my female slaves, which may be born after the first day of January, 1850, shall be free at the respective ages, of the males at twenty-eight, and of the females at twenty-five; and that the three years next preceding their arrival at the age of freedom, they

* Note B., page 346.

shall be entitled to their hire or wages for those years, or of the fair value of their services, to defray the expense of transporting them to one of the African colonies, and of furnishing them with an outfit on their arrival there. And I further direct, that they be taught to read, to write, and to cipher, and that they be sent to Africa. I further will and direct, that the issue of any of the females, who are so to be entitled to their freedom, at the age of twenty-five, shall be deemed free from their birth, and that they be bound out as apprentices to learn farming, or some useful trade, upon the condition also, of being taught to read, to write, and to cipher. And I direct, also, that the age of twenty-one having been attained, they shall be sent to one of the African colonies, to raise the necessary funds for which purpose, if they shall not have previously earned them, they must be hired out a sufficient length of time.

"I require and enjoin my executors and descendants to pay particular attention to the execution of this provision of my will. And if they should sell any of the females who or whose issue are to be free, I especially desire them to guard carefully the rights of such issue by all suitable stipulations and sanctions in the contract of sale. But I hope that it may not be necessary to sell any such persons who are to be entitled to their freedom, but that they may be retained in the possession of some of my descendants."

In one of the debates on the Compromise of 1850, Mr. Clay made a very interesting allusion to his Letter on Emancipation, above referred to, which will be found in the Appendix.*

* Note C., page 353.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

The Plan of Mr. Clay.—What is a Compromise?—Ultraists opposed to Mr. Clay.—Abuse by Abolitionists.—Slavery abolished in Mexico.—Mr. Bell's Resolutions.—Mr. Foote's Motion for a Committee of Thirteen.—An extraordinary Scene in the Senate.—Report of the Committee of Thirteen.—Its Reception.—Opposition of the President.—Mr. Clay's Remarks upon this Opposition.—Mr. Bell defends the President.—Death of the President.—Mr. Clay's Disinterestedness.—Mr. Webster on the Wilmot Proviso.—Mr. Clay's Opinion on carrying Slavery into the Territories.—Consequences of the Defeat or Success of the Bill.—Treason in South Carolina.—Defeat of the Bill a Victory.

HAVING, in the preceding chapter, reviewed at large Mr. Clay's exposition and vindication of his Compromise resolutions as contained in his speech of February 5th and 6th, 1850, it is proper that we proceed to the subsequent action of the Senate and of Congress, which grew out of this important movement of Mr. Clay—more especially and chiefly to notice the part sustained by Mr. Clay in such action. Mr. Clay had opened the wide field of debate, and commenced the movement, which could not now be arrested, and which must necessarily come to some result. His resolutions covered the whole ground; but he never expected that all these branches of the general subject could be embraced in a single bill. He was forced to group them in one array, as points or topics which imperatively demanded the consideration and legislation of Congress, whether in half a dozen, less or more, separate measures, he did not claim to specify, in the act of propounding the subjects. But certain senators seemed desirous that the topics should not be separated, but that all of them should move on in legislative action and in debate *pari passu*, which, of course, would be impossible for the accomplishment of the end in view. The admission of California as a State, was a distinct question, and might be acted on by itself. "I do not think it would be right," said

Mr. Clay, on the 14th of February, "to embrace in a general motion the question of the admission of California and all the other subjects treated of by the resolutions upon the table—the subject, for example, of the establishment of Territorial governments, the subject of the establishment of a boundary line for Texas, and the proposition to compensate Texas for the surrender of territory. I say, sir, I do not think it would be right to confound or to combine all these subjects, and to throw them before one Committee to be acted upon together. * * * My first proposition relates to California; the second to the Territorial government; the third and fourth to Texas; the fifth and sixth to the District of Columbia; the seventh to the recovery of fugitive slaves; etc. * * * Why, sir, it is impossible that any body could conceive, that I intended to embrace all this variety of subjects in one bill, and propose the passage of them all at once."

It is sufficient, in this place, that we recognize the plan of Mr. Clay, so far as that he never contemplated the incorporation of all his propositions in one bill. The idea was absurd, and the project impracticable.

Then, as now, there were men who were opposed to all compromises, and professed to go for what they called right. Hearing so much on this point, Mr. Clay took occasion to remark: "There are persons who are very wise in their own esteem, and who will reject all compromises; but that is no reason why a compromise should not be attempted. I go for honorable compromise, when occasions call for it. Life itself is but a compromise, until the Great Destroyer finally triumphs. All legislation, all government, all society, is formed upon the principle of mutual concession, politeness, comity, courtesy: upon these every thing is based. I bow to you to-day, because you bow to me. You are respectful to me, because I am respectful to you. Compromise is peculiarly appropriate between the members of a Republic, as of one common family. Compromises have this recommendation, that if you concede any thing, you have something conceded to you in return. Treaties are compromises made with foreign powers, which is not a case like this. Here, if you concede any thing, it is to your own brethren—to your own family Let him who elevates himself above humanity, above its weaknesses, its infirmities, its wants, its necessities, say, if he pleases, I never will compromise; but let no one who is not above the

frailties of our common nature, disdain compromises." If Mr. Clay excelled in any thing, it was in his common sense, and in the practical bearing which he gave to every subject which he touched. The above remarks on compromise, are eminently of this character. Here the practical bearings of an abstract principle are most impressively depicted. After reading it, any man ought to be ashamed who objects to compromise. What is more evident than that it enters into the life of man, in all his relations, and not less into the structure of general society?

Mr. Clay's resolutions had the following remarkable sanction of Mr. Webster, in the course of the debate on the subject: "I will say, that I feel under great obligations to the honorable senator from Kentucky, for introducing the subject, and for the very lucid speech which he made, and which has been so much read throughout the whole country."

Mr. Clay had the misfortune—perhaps we should say good fortune, as truth generally lies between extremes—to be equally assailed by ultra Southern men and Northern abolitionists. The following remarks of his, on two different occasions, will illustrate this, and show the force of his determination to do his duty:

"With regard to the reference which the gentleman (Mr. Foote) has made to a letter of mine addressed to a Free-soil Convention, in Ohio, during the past summer—that is all fair, and I shall state what the contents of the letter were. I was invited to attend the celebration of an anniversary of the passage of the ordinance of 1787; and I think I gave a very delicate rebuke to the parties who sent me the invitation. I said it was the first time the day had been celebrated, although sixty years have elapsed since the passage of that ordinance. I added, and I add here and everywhere, that not one of them, that no man in the United States, was more opposed than I was to the introduction of slavery into any of the new territories of this country by positive enactment of law, and that I did not believe there existed, under the present state of what I conceive to be the laws of Mexico, any right on the part of any individual to carry slaves there. That was what was in the letter. * * * *

"I really should be much indebted to the honorable senator (Mr. Foote) for the sympathy which he felt for me, in respect to the recent attack in the newspaper laid on our desks. But, sir, I desire the sympathy of no man—the forbearance of no man. I desire to escape from no responsibility of my public conduct on account of my age, or for any other cause. I ask for none.

I am in a peculiar situation, Mr. President, if you will allow me to say so—without any earthly object of ambition before me—standing, as it were, on the brink of eternity—separated to a great extent from all the earthly ties which connect a mortal with this transitory state. I am *here*, expecting soon to go *hence*, and owing no responsibility but that which I owe to my own conscience and to God. Ready to express my opinions upon all and upon every subject, I am determined to do so; and no imputation, no threat, no menace, no application of awe or of terrors to me will be availing in restraining me from expressing them. None, none whatever. The honorable senator (Mr. Foote) may deem me an abolitionist, if he chooses. Be it so. Sir, if there is a well-abused man in the country—if I were to endeavor to find out the man above all others the most abused by abolitionists, it is the humble individual now addressing you. The honorable senator from Mississippi does not, perhaps, see these papers as I do; but they all pour out, from their vials of wrath, bitterness which is perfectly indescribable; and they put epithets into their papers accompanied with all the billingsgate which they can employ; and lest I should not see them, they invariably take occasion, in these precious instances of traduction, to send their papers to me. I wish the honorable senator could have an opportunity of seeing some of them."

Here Mr. Cass said, "I can give the honorable senator from Mississippi a basket of them, if he will take the trouble to read them; and I must say, that the honorable senator from Kentucky (Mr. Clay) is about the best abused man in all this Union."

"Now, sir," continued Mr. Clay, "when I brought forward these resolutions, I intended, so help me God, to propose a plan of doing equal and impartial justice to the South and to the North, so far as I could comprehend it, and I think it does yet. But how has this effort been received by the ultraists? Why, sir, at the North they cry out, 'It is all concession to the South,' And, sir, what is the language of the South? They say, 'It is all concession to the North,' and I assure you, Mr. President, it has reconciled me very much to my poor efforts, to find that the ultraists, on the one hand and on the other, equally traduce the scheme I propose as conceding every thing to their opponents. * * *

"The honorable Senator (Mr. Foote) said, I had gone over to the ranks of the enemy. Enemy! Where have we enemies in this happy and glorious Confederacy? I know no foes, no

enemies, no opponents, either at the North or at the South. I consider us all as one family, all as friends, all as brethren. I consider us all as united in one common destiny; and those efforts which I shall continue to employ will be to keep us together as one family, in concord and harmony; and, above all, to avoid that direful day when one part of the Union can speak of the other as an enemy!"

The peculiar position of Mr. Clay, in this movement, as above depicted by himself, is indeed touching. He had nothing to hope for from the country, in compensation for his efforts. His days as a politician were numbered. He felt that he stood on the brink of the grave, and that this very labor might carry him down into it. In this position he could say things which no other man could say. Ever honest and true, he could not be otherwise now; and his words had great weight. All parties and opponents heeded him. As he himself claimed, he consulted only his conscience, the welfare of the country, and his responsibility to God. He told the South and the North what he thought they ought to be told—to both he uttered some unpalatable truths; and he called upon each to make such concession to the other, as the state of the country required for the adjustment of all controversy between these two sections of the Republic.

This great debate, opened by Mr. Clay on the 5th and 6th of February, continued, at intervals, for months, and Mr. Clay was always at his post, when it was the order of the day. We seldom find him in the Senate on other days. His health was insufficient, and his great solicitude was to bring these questions to the right issue, that whenever God should call him hence, he should leave his country in peace and harmony with itself.

On the 27th of February, Mr. Benton, of Missouri, entertained and instructed the Senate, on the history of the abolition of slavery in the Republic of Mexico. His showing evinced great and thorough research in the documentary history of Mexico, and if any had doubted before, there could be but one opinion now, and that is, that slavery in Mexico had been abolished, as maintained by Mr. Clay in his second proposition.

In this matter, Mr. Benton did Mr. Clay a good service; for the abolition of slavery in Mexico was not generally admitted by Southern men.

On the 28th of February, Mr. Bell, of Tennessee, brought

forward in the Senate a series of resolutions, having the same object with those of Mr. Clay, and explained them at length The first four of these resolutions related to Texas; the fifth proposed to establish one Territorial government for all the Territories acquired from Mexico, except California, and those parts lying within the bounds of Texas; the sixth proposed to admit California; the seventh proposed legislation for the future action of Territories in erecting themselves into States; the eighth asserted the right of Territories to frame State Constitutions agreeable to themselves, under the restrictions of the Federal Constitution; and the ninth and last, that a Committee be appointed to prepare a bill to incorporate the spirit and principles of these resolutions.

Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, moved, that a select committee of thirteen, six from the north and six from the south, with a chairman for the thirteenth, be appointed, to take Mr. Clay's and Mr. Bell's resolutions as a basis of compromise, and to report a bill or bills thereon. After a debate running through a number of weeks, Mr. Foote's resolution was adopted, and the committee appointed by ballot, as follows: Mr. Clay, chairman. From the North, Messrs. Cass, Dickinson, Bright, Webster, Phelps, and Cooper. From the South, Messrs. King, Mason, Downs, Mangum, Bell, and Berrien*.

* In the debate in Senate, on the 17th of April, on referring Mr. Clay's and Mr. Bell's propositions of compromise, to a committee of thirteen, an extraordinary scene occurred. Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, said, "the signers of 'the Southern address,' written by Mr. Calhoun, had been *denounced*. By whom? By a gentleman long denominated the oldest member of the Senate—the father of the Senate. By a gentleman who, on a late occasion—" Here Mr. Benton, of Missouri, alluded to, rose from his seat and walked toward Mr. Foote; and Mr. Foote, who occupied a seat on the outer circle, in front of the Vice-President's chair, retreated backward down the aisle, toward the chair of the Vice-President, with a pistol in his hand. Mr. Benton advanced by the aisle, outside the bar, toward Mr. Foote, following him into the aisle down which he had retreated. In a moment every senator was on his feet. Calls of "order," demands for the sergeant-at-arms, and requests from the chair for senators to be seated, were loudly and earnestly vociferated. Mr. Benton was followed and arrested by Mr. Dodge, of Wisconsin, and in the excitement and confusion that prevailed, Mr. Benton was heard to exclaim, from time to time, "I have no pistols!" "Let him fire!" "Stand out of the way!" "I have no pistols!" "I disdain to carry arms." While making these exclamations, Mr. Benton was brought back to his seat; but breaking away from Mr. Dodge, who sought forcibly to detain him, he advanced again toward Mr. Foote, who stood near the Vice-President's chair, on the right hand side, surrounded by senators. Mr. Dickinson, of New York, took the pis-

The Committee of Thirteen was appointed on the 19th of April, and Mr. Clay, the Chairman, reported on the 8th of May They brought in three separate bills, covering most of the ground occupied by Mr. Clay's and Mr. Bell's resolutions; one for the admission of California, organizing the Territorial Govern-

tol from the hand of Mr. Foote, and locked it up in his desk; and Mr. Foote, at the solicitation of Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, returned to his seat.

The Vice-President directed that senators and spectators should be seated, and order was partially restored; but much confusion prevailed.

Mr. Clay said: "I hope that order will be restored."

Mr. Benton: "We are not going to get off in this way. A pistol has been brought here to assassinate me. The scoundrel had no reason to think I was armed. For I carry nothing of the kind, sir."

Mr. Foote: "I brought it here to defend myself."

Mr. Benton: "Nothing of the kind, sir. It is a false imputation. I carry nothing of the kind, and no assassin has a right to draw a pistol on me."

Several senators: "Order! order!"

Mr. Benton: "It is a mere pretext of the assassin. Will the senate take notice of it? Or shall I be forced to go and get a weapon myself? A pistol has been brought here, and drawn upon me by an assassin.

The Vice-President: "Senators will be seated."

Mr. Foote: "Mr. President—"

The Vice-President: "Senators will be pleased to suspend their remarks until order is restored. Senators are requested to be seated."

Mr. Clay: "Mr. President—"

The Vice-President: "Business can not proceed until order is restored. There is too much noise in the galleries."

Mr. Foote: "May I proceed in order?"

Mr. Benton: "I demand that the Senate shall take immediate cognizance of the fact of this pistol having been brought here to assassinate me, under the villainous pretext that I was armed—the pretext of every assassin who undertakes to make out a case of self-defense, when plotting the death of his victim. Will the Senate notice it? Or shall I myself? For it shall not pass."

Mr. Foote: "If my presenting a pistol here has been thought anything but self-defense, after threats of personal chastisement, it is doing me a wrong. I saw him advancing toward me, and I took it for granted he was armed. Had I thought otherwise, I should have stopped to meet him in that narrow alley."

The Vice-President: "The senator will suspend his remarks for a moment."

Mr. Hale, of New Hampshire: "Mr. President, I rise to a privileged question, to ask the Senate, whether it is not due to itself, that this subject should be investigated?"

Mr. Foote: "I court it. It is my earnest desire that this matter may be investigated. Being threatened with chastisement, and informed that I was likely to be attacked, I simply prepared to resist an attack, but resolved to make no attack myself. If the senator had advanced down the alley to attack me, it was my purpose to defend myself."

Mr. Dodge. "Mr. President, I move, sir, that a committee of five be ap-

ments, and determining the boundaries of Texas. This, as will be seen, embraced the first, second, third, and fourth resolutions of Mr. Clay. The second bill proposed enactments for the recovery of fugitive slaves; and the third was framed to put an end to the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. These two

pointed by the chair, to investigate the whole matter, and report all the facts to the Senate."

Mr. Mangum: "Let it be a committee of seven."

Mr. Dodge: "I accept the amendment."

The resolution was as follows: "*Resolved*, That a committee of seven be appointed to investigate the disorder of to-day in the Senate, and that they report to the Senate what befits the occasion, and have power to examine witnesses, and take testimony on the case."

Mr. Clay: "I should have risen earlier, sir, but for a reason which I will not name at present. I think the course which has been proposed a very proper one. The facts which unfortunately occurred, were, I suppose, within the observation of most of the senators. I was not looking on at the moment; for my attention was drawn from that part of the body. But I think the resolution does not go far enough. I think the two senators ought to be placed under an obligation to keep the peace, and for that purpose, that they should, either voluntarily or otherwise, go before some magistrate of the city, or that both of them in their places, should here pledge themselves—which would be more gratifying to me—not to pursue this matter further than what occurred to-day. If the two senators will make such a promise, I shall he extremely happy."

Mr. Benton: "I have done nothing upon God Almighty's earth to authorize any man to charge me with a breach of the peace, and I will rot in jail before I will give a promise admitting that the charge is true. I regret nothing. It is lying and cowardly to impute to me the bearing of arms here, in order to justify the use of them upon me."

Mr. Clay: "My observations did not relate to the past, but to the future. I did not pretend to say whether either or both of the parties were in fault. I merely expressed a wish in reference to the future, and without reference to the past, that the two senators should come under some legal or personal obligation not to push this matter further."

Mr. Foote: "Mr. President—"

Several senators: "Be cool."

Mr. Foote: "I am perfectly cool, and I feel the gravity of the occasion, as much as others. * * * I have never worn arms to make an attack on any person, and have never worn arms in the Senate, except when menaced as I was the other day in the Senate, with a cudgel. My friends urged me, that being of small size, and quite feeble in health, I should at least wear arms for my own defense. I put on arms simply for self-defense, supposing it possible, after what had occurred, that I might be attacked."

The resolution for appointing a committee of investigation was adopted, and the chair was requested to make the appointment, which was announced the next day.

The occasion of this scene seems to have been the use of personalities in de-

comprised the ground of Mr. Clay's sixth and seventh resolutions His fifth and eighth resolutions were mere declarations, and were not intended as material for legislation. These bills, therefore, covered the whole ground of Mr. Clay's resolutions. So far as Mr. Bell's resolutions went beyond Mr. Clay's, in the matter of legislating for the direction of Territories in the formation of State Governments, it does not seem to be provided for in these bills, though it was manifestly a pertinent and important object, since so many irregularities have been practiced in the formation of new States, as, for example, in the cases of Michigan and California. Mr. Clay made a strong vindication of the irregularities of California, and said she was obliged to form a government, as the previous Congress had adjourned without providing her with a Territorial organization. If California had not provided for herself, she would have been left in a state of anarchy.

Since California had made such a leap into the future, and so grievously disappointed the South in forming a State Government prohibiting slavery, the South was anxious to arrest her admission into the Union, until a slave State could be formed elsewhere, and thus maintain the balance of power in the Senate

bate between Mr. Foote and Mr. Benton, on the 26th of March. Mr. Foote had said: "I am glad that the honorable Senator from Missouri has come into the war. We meet again at Philippi. I have known all along the spirit which actuated that honorable Senator. I know something of his designs and motives, and the country shall know them. The Senator need not think of frightening anybody by a blustering and dogmatic demeanor."

Mr. Benton, in reply, had said: "Mr. President, I believe this is the American Senate. I believe, by a rule of this Senate, that personalities and attacks upon motives, are forbidden. I also believe that they are forbidden by the rules of decorum. This much I believe; and now, sir, I will tell you what I know. I know that the attacks made upon my motives to-day and heretofore, in this chamber, are false and cowardly."

Mr. Foote had also said in the Senate: "Sir, I will formally announce, that there are certain stains which have most hideously blemished the character of the honorable Senator from Missouri, since the days of his early manhood."

In reply, Mr. Benton said: "I pronounce it cowardly to give insults where they can not be chastised. Can I take a cudgel to him here?"

Several senators: "Order! order!"

Mr. Benton: "Is a senator to be blackguarded here, in the discharge of his duty, and the culprit go unpunished?"

The Vice-President: "The Senator is called to order."

Mr. Benton: "Well, sir, write down the words."

Three weeks after this, occurred the extraordinary scene in the Senate, above given.

of the United States. But where could a slave State be formed? By the joint resolution for the annexation of Texas, that State was entitled to make four new States, with slavery or without, provided slavery would not be carried above the line of 36° 30'. But Texas was not ready for a new State. The Committee say: "While they conceive that the right of admission into the Union of any new States carved out of the Territory of Texas, not exceeding the number specified (four), and under the conditions stated, can not be justly controverted, the Committee do not think that the formation of any such new States should now originate with Congress. The initiative, in conformity with the usage which has heretofore prevailed, should be taken by a portion of the people of Texas themselves, who may be desirous of constituting a new State, with the consent of Texas." California, therefore, must either be left out, or come in alone as a free State. For reasons we have before stated, her application could not with prudence be rejected. Nevertheless, there were several devices that might be employed to embarrass her admission. Nobody doubted that her population was sufficient; yet no census had been taken, and this qualification could not be proved. She had fixed her own boundaries, on a large scale. That was objected to. It was also moved, that she should not go further south than the line of 36° 30', that a slave State might be formed below that line. But these objections could not be sustained. All saw that California must come in on her own terms; and as a large amount of political capital lay in that quarter for the Presidential race, some of the aspirants for the Presidency were foremost in advocating the immediate admission of California. Their motives were too apparent not to be clearly discerned. They objected even that California should be put in the same bill with the Territories, or with any other incongruous subject, as they termed it. They talked largely of the dignity of California, and maintained that she should not be mixed up with any thing else. Nevertheless, Mr. Clay, as Chairman of the Committee of Thirteen put California in the same bill with the Territories. "Why," said Mr. Clay, "she occupies the same position, and is herself only a Territory, so far as law is concerned." While no man had more respect for California than Mr. Clay, he would not pander to her vanity, if she had such a quality. Nor did they who talked so loudly of the rights of California gain what they hoped, for their motives were too apparent.

There was a middle ground between the Southron who would reject California, and the politician who would throw out a bait to her by excessive zeal in favor of her claims; and that was the ground occupied by Mr. Clay. Mr. Clay maintained his own dignity, without imparing that of California.

In the discussion which followed the presentation of this report, on the same day Mr. Clay said: "Sir, with respect to the report, and with respect to these bills, I have interested myself in the cause of my country, I have interested myself in the great cause of this Union, and of harmony among its distracted parts, and I stand here, and here I mean to stand, to vindicate what has been done, and to vindicate this report, too, if necessary, from beginning to end, and to show that it is founded in reason, in fact, and in truth. But I will not now, sir, be drawn into a discussion which I think untimely, premature, and calculated to make an impression unfavorable to the final action of the body."

One delights to see these occasional bursts of eloquence, and to imagine the effect which they produced: "Here I stand, and here I mean to stand," the object being declared. Mr. Clay had fallen into the line of this Committee of Thirteen, and became its Chairman, not by his own choice, but because the matter had taken such a shape by a movement unprompted by him. He was in the ship, and they were pleased to give him the command of the deck; and while occupying this post, he could only enact himself. He had written the report and he would vindicate it. He had taken care that it should embody all which he thought material for positive legislation on the points contained in his resolutions. He had begun the work, and he would finish it, God helping him. "Here I stand."

It is pleasing to see Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, who had been one of the most violent opposers of Mr. Clay's resolutions when first brought forward, so modified and so patriotic as he had now got to be, and apparently ready to approve of the report. He said: "I wish my friends from the South to understand me distinctly. I do not profess to have more moral courage than other men; but much as I respect and confide in them, and much as I should delight to co-operate with them, if it should turn out—as I hope will be the case—that I can approve of this report and concur with the committee—and I, as earnestly as any member of that committee, desire to see the great objects accomplished, for

which they have so assiduously, patriotically, and nobly labored—I shall dare to give my assent to it. And I shall dare to do more, to endeavor, in my humble way, in every shape and form, to satisfy my countrymen, north, south, east, and west, that this report is worthy of their approval. I shall not favor any attempt to get up a sectional agitation; and as far as I myself am concerned, I am willing to leave it to the good sense and sound patriotism of the people, whom I have the honor in part to represent here, feeling satisfied, that, if laboring to do right, I should happen to fail in some slight respects, I should be more than forgiven; I should be justified. * * * I urged upon my friend from Alabama (Mr. Clemens), that, if the report were of a certain character, he should make no hasty or rash opposition to it."

It is evident from this language of Mr. Foote, that he had begun to think well of Mr. Clay's proposals of compromise. He had had time to think of them from the 29th of January, when they were first brought forward, to the 8th of May, when the report from the Committee of Thirteen was presented. He had himself moved for this committee, and his resolution was adopted. Mr. Foote knew very well that Mr. Clay wrote the report, and that it was an embodiment of his resolutions excepting only those parts which were merely declaratory of opinion. The minds of a majority of the Senate had, no doubt, begun to feel that Mr. Clay was right, and that there was no escape from the course he had indicated, whether it should be done by adopting the report, and carrying its proposals forward into the forms of law, or by some other course. The whole subject was now ripe for final action, though, as we shall see, it did afterward take other and separate forms. But no new light could be thrown upon it. It had been thoroughly debated, and the wisdom and pertinency of Mr. Clay's resolutions were now fully appreciated. He had no occasion to utter a single word. They had gone forth before the country, and they were almost universally approved, as a system of compromise. There was opposition, but it was rather factious than reasonable.

It is a remarkable fact in the history of our government, that, after the report of the Committee of Thirteen was made, and during the entire debate thereon, till the measure was lost—and it was lost on that account—a vigorous opposition was made to it by the Executive, General Taylor. It is still more remarkable that such an interference of one department of the govern-

ment with the action of another, did not shock the public mind, and draw forth the loudest remonstrances. For nothing can be more evident than that it was impertinent in the highest degree. It is a matter of extreme delicacy for one department of the government to interfere with another, and one can not conceive of a case in which it would be justifiable.

It is a right and duty of the President to recommend to Congress such measures as he may think proper, and it is usual and respectful in Congress to consider such recommendations. But Congress is a co-ordinate branch of the government, and independent in its prerogatives and functions. It is not obliged to adopt what the President recommends, and it may, and usually does, originate measures not recommended by the Executive. It may adopt his recommendations in part, and reject them in part; or it may reject them altogether, though occasions for this latter course would hardly ever occur.

President Taylor had recommended that California should be received into the Union, and that the Territories acquired from Mexico should be left as they were, under the care of the national Executive; in other words, under military rule; for this latter had been their condition since the peace, and it would remain so, unless Congress should organize Territorial governments. It was now the imperative duty of Congress to organize the new Territories.

But the President seemed to think that this course was a disrespect to his recommendation. Suppose it was. What then? Congress was not obliged to follow it; but it was bound, as a co-ordinate and independent branch of the government, to discharge its own appropriate functions, and one of those functions was to organize governments for the new Territories, Utah and New Mexico. But the President had recommended to leave them in his hands! He would take care of them!

Hence the interference. Mr. Clay, in his resolutions, and the Committee of Thirteen in their report, had thought it a duty of Congress to provide a government for the Territories acquired from Mexico. It was, indeed, a stipulation of the treaty with Mexico. Strange to say, the President of the United States resented this disrespect to his recommendation. Such is the inference from the course he pursued. He started an open and vigorous opposition to the measures proposed by the Committee of Thirteen, through such journals as could be subsidized, and by

such other means as the federal executive can usually command outside and inside of Congress. A party in both houses of Congress was instantly formed for this specific object. From that hour the project of the Committee of Thirteen was doomed. And yet it was precisely the measure which the state of the country required; which, indeed, it could not dispense with; and there is no knowing what disastrous consequences might have followed if the President had not died, and left open an opportunity for the same proposals to be adopted in separate bills, before this Congress adjourned. The following are some of Mr. Clay's remarks on this opposition of the President:

"Mr. President, I will take occasion to say, that I came to Washington with the most anxious desire—a desire which I still entertain—to co-operate in my legislative position, in all cases in which I could conscientiously do it, with the executive branch of the government. It is with great pleasure that I state that we do co-operate with the President to the extent which he recommends. He recommends the admission of California. The committee propose this. But there the President's recommendation stops, and then we take up the subject.

* * * * * * *

"I am forced, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senate to a very painful duty, let it subject me to what misinterpretation it may, here or elsewhere. I mean the duty of contrasting the plan proposed by the Executive of the United States with the plan proposed by the Committee of Thirteen. * * * What is the plan of the President? I will describe it by a simile, in a manner which can not be misunderstood. Here are five wounds—one, two, three, four, five—bleeding, and threatening the well-being, if not the existence of the body politic. What is the plan of the President? Is it to heal all these wounds? No such thing. It is only to heal one of the five, and to leave the other four to bleed more profusely than ever, by the sole admission of California, even if it should produce death itself. I have said that five wounds are open and bleeding. What are they? First, there is California; next, there are the Territories; third, there is the question of the boundary of Texas; fourth, there is the fugitive-slave bill; and fifth, there is the question of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. The President, instead of proposing a plan comprehending all the diseases of the country, looks only to one. * * * I have seen with profound surprise and regret, the persistence—for so I am painfully compelled to regard the facts around us—of the Chief Magistrate of the country in his own peculiar plan. I think that in the spirit of compromise, the President ought to unite with us. He recommends

the admission of California. We are willing to admit California. We go with him as far as he goes, and we make its admission compose a part of a general plan of settlement and compromise, which we propose to the consideration of the Senate. In the spirit of compromise which, I trust, does, and which I know ought to, animate both ends of Pennsylvania-avenue, we had a right to suppose, when the committee announced in their report, that they were satisfied with his recommendation, so far as it went, but that it did not go, in our respectful judgment, far enough, and that we therefore offered our measure to close up the four remaining wounds. I think, that in a spirit of peace and concord, and of mutual confidence and co-operation, which ought to animate the different departments of the government, the President, entertaining that constitutional deference to the wisdom of Congress which he has professed, and abstaining, as he has declared he would abstain, from any interference with its free deliberations, ought, without any disatisfaction, to permit us to consider what is best for our common country. I will go a little further in this comparison which I make most painfully. After the observations which I addressed to the Senate a week ago, I did hope and trust there would have been a reciprocation from the other end of the avenue, as to the desire to heal, not one wound only—which being healed would exasperate instead of harmonizing the country—but to heal them all. I did hope, that we should have had some signification in some form or other, of the Executive contentment and satisfaction with the entire plan of adjustment. But instead of concurrence with the committee, on the part of the Executive, we have an authentic assurance of his adherence exclusively to his own particular scheme.

"Mr. President, with regard to Utah, there is no government whatever, unless it is such as necessity has prompted the Mormons to establish; and when you come to New Mexico, what government have you? A military government, by a Lieutenant-Colonel of the army! A Lieutenant-Colonel, a mere subordinate of the army of the United States, holds the government for them, in a time of profound peace! Stand up, Whig, who can—stand up, Democrat, who can—and defend the establishment of a military government, in this free and glorious republic, in a time of profound peace! Sir, we had doubts about the authority of the late President to do this in a time of war, and it was cast as a reproach upon him. But here, in a time of profound peace, it is pro posed by the highest authority, that this government—this military government—and by what authority it has continued since the peace, I know not—should be continued indefinitely, till New Mexico is prepared to come as a State into the Union! And when will that be? * * * And what will become of the several obligations of the treaty of Hidalgo, requiring us to ex-

tend the protection of government to the people of Utah and New Mexico?" * * *

Well might Mr. Clay say, in view of this unexpected opposition: "I must own that a hundred times, almost, during the progress of this bill, I have been quite ready to yield, and say for one, I withdraw from all further efforts. I never have seen a measure so much opposed. We exhibit the spectacle of a *seesaw*, putting the least weight on one side, while there is an obstacle to the balance on the opposite side. While all parties are, or ought to be, desirous of harmonizing the country, and of restoring tranquillity, difficulties almost insuperable, upon points of abstraction, upon points of no earthly practical consequence, start up from time to time, to discourage the stoutest heart in any effort to accommodate all these difficulties."

Again he says: "Mr. President, I find myself in a peculiar and painful position, in respect to the defense of this report. I find myself assailed by extremists everywhere; by under-currents; by those in high, as well as those in low authority; but believing as I do, that this measure, and this measure only will pass, if any does pass, during the present session of Congress, I shall stand up to it, and to this report, against all objections, springing from whatever quarter they may."

When Mr. Bell, of Tennessee, made his speech on this measure, the 3d of July, he defended the President, and among other things, said: "Especial pains have been taken by senators to hold up the antagonism of the plan of adjustment presented by the Committee of Thirteen, and that of the President, in a way to present the issue as one between the Executive and Congress. The honorable and distinguished senator from Kentucky (Mr. Clay), to my infinite regret, led the way. The honorable senator shakes his head."

Mr. Clay: "Will the honorable senator from Tennessee permit me to interrupt him for a moment?"

Mr. Bell: "Certainly."

Mr. Clay: "It will be recollected by the Senate, and I am sure by the senator from Tennessee, that it was a week only, or about eight or ten days prior to my delivery of the speech to which he refers, that I made a speech as conciliatory toward the administration as it was possible for me to find language to put it in. Immediately—I believe it was the day after the delivery

of that speech—the editor of the *Republic*, the organ of the President, came out with the declaration, that the President adhered to his own plan. Shortly after this those editors were dismissed, among other reasons, because they approved of the plan of the Committee.

"I came here," said Mr. Clay, "with the most anxious desire to co-operate with the Administration in all public measures. * * * If that article in the *Republic* had stood alone, and had not been followed up by the subsequent dismissal of the editors of that paper; if I had not known, and did not feel at this moment in every vein of my body, the influence which the Administration has exerted outside of Congress, and inside of Congress, and in both houses of Congress; if I did not know that the secretaries and heads of departments, have denounced this measure, and that the President himself, in derision had called it the Omnibus Bill—it was all these circumstances taken together that led me to the conclusion that I would defend the measure; and, sir, I would defend it against a thousand Presidents, be they who they may."

Mr. Bell said: "The old question is presented, whether Mohammed will go to the mountain, or the mountain shall come to Mohammed. I do not undertake to say which is Mahommed, or which is the mountain."

Mr. Clay: "I beg pardon, I only wanted the mountain to let me alone."

Mr. Bell: "Sir, it was announced, that the President would not change his opinion, and this the honorable senator considers an attack upon the plan of the Committe of Thirteen."

Mr. Clay (in his seat): "Not that alone. There were other concurring circumstances."

Mr. Bell: "I know it has been said, that one or more of the secretaries had been talking against the Compromise."

Mr. Clay (in his seat): "Ah! Ah!"

Mr. Bell, however, still bore this testimony, that he believed "General Taylor had been influenced in his course upon this subject by the highest and noblest motives of duty and patriotism." Quite probable. But General Taylor was a child to Mr. Clay on this, and on any other question of high statesmanship, and it was suitable that he should manifest some deference to the combined wisdom of the senate, as expressed in this report. His opposition, combined with that which sprung up from other

quarters, killed the measure. But after his death, the same objects were accomplished in separate bills, which were approved by Mr. Fillmore. It is doubtful, perhaps, whether they could have been accomplished under General Taylor, and the country might still have been left in a very sad condition of discontentment, not to say, of portentous inquietude. It is evident enough, that, if Congress had stopped with the admission of California, as recommended by the President, it would have aggravated the difficulties in which the country was involved.

General Taylor died on the 9th of July. On the 17th of the same month, Mr. Webster said in the Senate: "There were circumstances attending the death of General Taylor, that were so fortunate, that, for his own fame and character, and for the gratification of all to whom he was most dear, he may be said to have died fortunately. 'That life is good which answers life's great end.'"

When Mr. Clay made his last set speech on the Compromise bill, July 22, vindicating it from the objections that had been made to it, and referring to the plan of the Executive (General Taylor's), some twelve days after General Taylor's death, he said: "Allow me to take this occasion—the only suitable one in my opinion—of expressing my deep regret and sympathy with the family of the illustrious deceased. I had known him, perhaps, longer than any other man in Washington, I knew his father before him—a most estimable and distinguished citizen of Kentucky. I knew the late President of the United States from the time he entered the army until his death. He was an honest man—a brave man. He had covered his own head with laurels, and added fame and renown to his country. *Without expressing any judgment upon what might have been the just appreciation of his administration of the domestic civil affairs of the country, if Providence had permitted him to serve out his time*, I take pleasure in the opportunity of saying, in reference to the foreign affairs of our Government, that, in all the instances of which any knowledge has been obtained by me of the mode in which they were conducted, they have met with my hearty and cordial concurrence. If I shall have any occasion to say any thing of the plan [of settling these domestic difficulties] proposed by the late President, it will be with the most perfect respect to his memory, without a single feeling of unkindness abiding in my breast. Peace to his ashes! and may he at this moment be en-

joying those blessings in another and a better world, which we are all desiring, sooner or later, to attain."

The enemies of the measure reported by the Committee of Thirteen, had given it the name of the "Omnibus bill," which gave occasion for some facetious remarks from Mr. Clay, of which the following are a specimen:

"It is said, Mr. President, that this 'Omnibus,' as it is called, contains too much. It is not, however, that it has too much in it. It has too little, according to the wishes of its opponents; and I am very sorry that our 'Omnibus' can not carry Mr. Wilmot, though his weight, I am afraid, would break it down, if he were put there. This incongruous measure, which has already too much matter in it, has not enough for the senator from Tennessee (Mr. Bell). He wants to put in two or three more States from Texas."

Mr. Clay spoke of the meeting of extremes in this debate—the slaveholders of the South and the abolitionists of the North. Both opposed the bill. He said these extremes seemed to be in mutual consultation. Mr. Mason, of Virginia, answered: "There certainly have been frequent consultations between senators from the Southern States upon questions involving the dignity, honor, and safety of the Southern States, involved, as they conceived, in the provisions of this bill." Whereupon, Mr. Clay, who had been accused of holding consultations with his political opponents, replied: "And so, undoubtedly, did *our* consultation relate to the dignity, honor, and safety of the UNION, and of the Constitution of our country." [Loud applause from the gallery, which was rebuked by the Chair.]

As manifested by the effect of this repartee in the gallery of the Senate Chamber, the popular sympathies were all on the side of Mr. Clay, in this protracted debate. It was so throughout the country.

Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, and Mr. Berrien, of Georgia, both of whom opposed the bill, had both expressed the hope that Mr. Clay might acquire enduring fame for his commendable zeal. Mr. Clay replied:

"Mr. President, I do not think about myself. I care not about myself. Neither men nor mankind have honors or offices in their gift which I expect, which I want, which I desire. Poised, as I feel myself in some degree, at my time of life, between heaven and earth, my hopes, my faith, my confidence, are to-

ward the former; and I only desire, while I remain upon earth, while I linger here, to perform all the duties which result from my connection with that society of which I am an humble member. These are the feelings with which I came here. I desire no *eclat* whatever. * * * As to the fate of this measure, I am prepared for it, whatever it may be. If defeat awaits it, I will not yet despair of the country. I shall have the consolation of knowing that I have sought, most anxiously, to perform my duty, my high duty to my country, and to the Constitution. I shall feel no other regrets connected with its failure, if that should be its fortune, than those which belong to this distracted people and to this menaced country. On my own account, none—none, whatever, shall I have occasion to feel, in the smallest degree."

When Mr. Webster observed that some senators felt bound by their instructions for the Wilmot Proviso, against their convictions, he said: "I have sometimes thought, when considering on this subject of the Wilmot Proviso, that Congress itself needs the WILMOT. I have thought that if the genius of American liberty, or some angel from a higher sphere, could fly over the country with a scroll bearing the words, and with power to give effect to those words, and those words should be, 'Be it ordained, that neither in the Senate, nor in the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, there shall be slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except for crime,' it would be a glorious and consoling honor and mercy to the Constitution of the country. Spirit of Nathan Dane! How couldst thou take so much pains to set men's limbs and motion free in the Territories, and never deign to add even a proviso for the freedom of conscience and opinion in the halls of Congress?"

In all quarters Mr. Clay had continually to encounter objections to compromise, as if it were a sacrifice of principle. Here we have another of his replies on this point:

"What is a compromise? It is a work of mutual concession—an agreement in which there are reciprocal stipulations—a work in which, for the sake of peace and concord, one party abates his extreme demands in consideration of the abatement of extreme demands by the other party. It is a measure of mutual concession, of mutual sacrifice. * * * Who were the parties in that greatest of all compromises, the Constitution of the United States? * * * The Constitution under which we sit at this moment, is the work of their hands—a great, a memorable, a magnificent compromise."

He also continually met with the averment, from the South, that the Federal Constitution carried slavery, and was bound to protect slavery in the Territories. Although we have cited him before on this point, the following has some new features:

"There are gentlemen who maintain that, by virtue of the Constitution, the right to carry slaves south of that line (36° 30') already exists. If I had not heard that opinion avowed, I should have regarded it one of the most extraordinary assumptions, and the most indefensible position that was ever taken by man. The Constitution neither created, nor does it continue slavery. Slavery existed independent of the Constitution, and antecedent to the Constitution; and it was dependent in the States, not upon the will of Congress, but upon the laws of the respective States. The Constitution is silent and passive upon the subject of the institution of slavery; or, rather, it deals with the fact as it exists in the States, without having created it, or continued it, or being responsible for it in the slightest degree. * * * If slaves are voluntarily carried into such a jurisdiction, [where slavery does not exist] their chains instantly drop off, and they become free, emancipated, liberated from their bondage. * * * If the Constitution possesses the paramount authority attributed to it, [that is, to protect slavery in the Territories,] the laws even of the free States of the Union would yield to that paramount authority. * * * You can not put your finger on the part of the Constitution which conveys the right or the power to carry slaves from one of the States of the Union to any Territory of the United States."

One would think that such passages as the above were sufficiently clear to define Mr. Clay's position on this question, and that his reasoning is not less conclusive. In the preceding chapter we have had occasion to notice forms of the same argument, to the same effect. The second resolution of Mr. Clay, brought forward on the 29th of January, declares the *lex loci* of Mexico, as to the abolition of slavery in that republic; and Mr. Clay, as in the language above cited, took occasion frequently, during this long-protracted debate, which continued several months, at intervals, to impress this fact on the mind of the Senate. Though he did not insist that the principle of his second resolution should be incorporated into the report of the Committee of Thirteen, as he could not obtain a majority, he nevertheless insisted on the fact, whenever the debate led him on that ground; and he carried out the principle, appertaining to the fact, as one of Public Law, excluding slavery from the Territories acquired

from Mexico, except as it should be introduced by a special act of Congress, or by the fundamental law of a new State. He admitted and claimed, as we have before seen in the preceding chapter, that Congress could establish or abolish slavery in the Territories. But there was no danger that Congress would establish slavery in the Territories, or in any part of them; first, because the North would never consent, and the South would not dare to do it. It would be admitting, on the part of the South, that Congress might touch the subject of slavery, and legislate it out of the Union. In the District of Columbia, Congress might touch, and even abolish it; for it has "*exclusive* jurisdiction there for *all purposes* whatsoever." So Mr. Clay maintained, though he thought it "inexpedient" to abolish slavery there, without the consent of Maryland, etc., as declared in one of his resolutions. But it was a matter of special pains with him, first to establish the fact, that slavery had been abolished in Mexico, and next to show, that no slaveholder could carry his slave into the Territories acquired from Mexico, under the Ægis of the Federal Constitution; in other words, that a slave could not be held as property, within the jurisdiction of the United States, outside of the jurisdiction of a slave-state, or of the District of Columbia, unless he were a fugitive. This, beyond all question, is the ground occupied and vindicated by Mr. Clay; and it appears in many forms during this great debate.

Toward the conclusion of Mr. Clay's argument on the 22d of July, when, as Chairman of the Committee of Thirteen, he undertook to answer the objections that had been made to the bill, he said:

"Mr. President, I approach now the question of what the consequences must be of the defeat of this measure now before the Senate, and what the consequence will be of the successful support of the measure by Congress. If the bill be defeated, and no equivalent measure be passed, and we go home, in what condition do we leave this free and glorious people? In regard to Texas, there is danger of two civil wars. * * * Assuming that Texas will move with military array upon New Mexico, there will probably be resistance on the part of the General Government to the entrance of the troops of Texas into the limits of New Mexico. * * * We know that the Administration [General Taylor's] which has just passed out of power, would in that contingency, have repelled the attack made by Texas. If the present Administration [Mr. Filmore's] should feel it incumbent upon itself to repel such an invasion, consequences

which I am about to portray, are at least possible, if not likely to occur."

Mr. Clay went on to depict the sympathy with Texas, which would pervade the entire South, and how the people of the slave States would rush to arms in aid of Texas, against the Federal forces—and who could tell the horrors and consequences of such a contest? "Why," said Mr. Clay, "it was only the other day, that a member, returned from the Nashville Convention [Mr. Rhett], addressed, we are told, the people of Charleston, South Carolina, proposing to hoist the standard of disunion? * * * Mr. President, I have no patience for hearing this bravado, come from what source it may. At the same time I am not disposed to underrate its importance, as one of many cotemporaneous events. There are certain great interests in this country which are sympathetic, contagious. * * * If a war breaks out between Texas and the troops of the United States, on the upper Rio Grande, there are ardent, enthusiastic spirits of Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama, that will flock to the standard of Texas, contending, as they will believe, for slave territory; and they will be drawn on, State after State, in all human probability, from the banks of the Rio Grande, to the banks of that river which flows by the tomb of Washington. * * *

"The honorable senator who usually sits before me (Mr. Hale), has told us more than once, that, if you pass this bill, you do not hush agitation; you even increase it. * * * The abolitionists, Mr. President, live by agitation. It is their meat, their bread, the air which they breathe, and if they saw, in its incipient state, a measure giving them more of that meat, bread, and air, do you believe they would oppose its adoption? Do you not believe that they would *hail* [Hale] it as a blessing? [Great laughter]. Why, Mr. President, there is not an abolitionist in the United States, that is not opposed to this bill. And why? They see their doom as certain as there is a God in heaven, who sends his Providential dispensations to calm the threatening storm, and to tranquilize agitated men. As certain as God exists in heaven, your business [turning to Mr. Hale], your vocation is gone. * * * What! increased agitation, and the agitators against the plan! It is an absurdity. * * *

"Let us consider the measure in detail. Let California be admitted into the Union—will they agitate about that? Establish the Territorial Governments—will they agitate about

that? When the Texas boundary question is settled—will they agitate about that? They have every probability of having New Mexico dedicated to free soil—will they agitate about that? About a Constitutional fugitive slave bill?* Will they agitate about the slave-trade in the District of Columbia? [when it is abolished, as proposed]. Then what can they agitate about, supposing the whole system of measures to be carried out? They might agitate a little about not getting the Wilmot Proviso fastened to the bill; and about not getting the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. What then, in the name of heaven, will they agitate about, if these five measures are carried? Whom will they agitate? Who will be their auditory? * * *

"I speak not of Free-soilers, who from principle are opposed to the extension of slavery, but of that fanatical, desperate band who call themselves, I don't know what—liberty-men, or something of the kind—and who have declared that this Union ought not to exist—who would strike down the pillars upon which stands the most glorious edifice that was ever erected by the hand of man, self-government—and who would crush amid the ruins of the fall of this people, all the hopes and expectations of ourselves and mankind; men who would go into the temples of the Holy God, and drag from their sacred posts the ministers who are preaching His Gospel, for the comfort of mankind and their salvation hereafter, and burn the temples themselves—*they* might agitate; men, who, if their power were equal to their malignity, would seize the sun in the heavens, drag it from the position where it keeps the planetary system in order, and replunge the world in chaos and confusion, to carry out their single idea—*they*, perhaps, might agitate. But the great body of the people of the United States will acquiesce in this adjustment, after near nine months of anxious and arduous struggle. No, sir; they may threaten agitation, talk of it *here* and elsewhere; but their occupation is gone. * * * The nation wants repose. It pants for repose, and entreats you to give it peace and tranquility. * * * The Missouri Compromise was hailed with joy and exultation. The bells rang, the cannons were fired, and every demonstration of joy was made throughout the land. But then, as now, when the bill was approaching its passage, it was said, 'It will not quell the storm, nor give peace to the country.'"

* The country acquiesced in it, till the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was passed.

Mr. Clay went on to speak of the results of the Tariff Compromise of 1833, how it pacified the country. He added: "I believe this measure is the dove of peace, which, taking its flight from the dome of this Capitol, will carry the glad tidings of assured peace and restored harmony to the remotest extremities of this distracted land. * * * And now let us go to the limpid fountain of unadulterated patriotism, and performing a solemn lustration, return divested of all selfish, sinister, and sordid passions, and think only of our God, our country, our consciences, and our glorious Union—that Union without which we shall be torn into hostile fragments, and sooner or later become the victims of military despotism, or foreign domination."

Mr. Barnwell, of South Carolina, saw fit to reply to Mr. Clay's reference to the speech made at Charleston, by a member of the Nashville Convention, who proposed to raise the flag of disunion, to which Mr. Clay rejoined: "I said nothing of the character of Mr. Rhett—for I might as well name him—I know him personally, and have some respect for him. But, if he pronounced the sentiment attributed to him, of raising the standard of disunion, of resistance to the common Government, whatever he *has* been, if he follows up that declaration by corresponding overt acts, HE WILL BE A TRAITOR, AND I HOPE HE WILL MEET WITH THE FATE OF A TRAITOR." [Great applause in the galleries, with difficulty suppressed by the Chair.] Mr. Clay continued: "I have heard with pain and regret a confirmation of the remark I made, that the sentiment of disunion is becoming familiar. I hope it is confined to South Carolina. I do not regard as my duty what the honorable senator seems to regard as his. If Kentucky, to-morrow, should unfurl the banner of resistance unjustly, I never will fight under that banner. I owe a paramount allegiance to the whole Union—a subordinate one to my own State. When my State is right, when it has a cause for resistance, when tyranny, and wrong, and oppression, insupportable, arise, I will then share her fortunes. But if she summon me to the battle-field, or to support her, in any cause that is unjust, against the Union, never, *never* will I engage with her in such a cause."

The speech from which the above extracts are taken, was delivered on the 22d of July, nearly six months after Mr. Clay introduced his resolutions of Compromise, as displayed in chapter

sixth. This was his last great speech, and it consumed a day in answering the objections to the bill, which was made incumbent on him as Chairman of the Committee. On the 8th of May, he made a great speech of two hours and a half. From the time he brought forward his resolutions, the 29th of January, to the 31st of July, when the bill passed, with nothing in it but the Territory of Utah, Mr. Clay had been on his feet in this debate seventy times—not always to say much, but frequently called out in some of his most forcible speeches. Every time that the subject of the bill was the order of the day, he was at his post, watching with intensity the action of the mind of the Senate, and embracing every opportunity to put forward the measure. It has been seen what opposition he had to encounter, springing up in new forms, and at every stage. But the movement which his own hand commenced, never flagged; and the final vote on the 31st of July, which had stricken every thing from the bill, but a Territorial Government for Utah, and which seemed to be a defeat, was nevertheless a victory. For the Senate did not come to this conclusion without having made up their minds to carry out, in separate bills, every thing proposed by the Committee of Thirteen, and this was perfectly understood. There was a nominal defeat, and yet a glorious triumph. The irresistible influence of Mr. Clay, so long and so well sustained, had successfully combated faction in all its forms, and converted opposition into a reluctant auxiliary. He had so shaped his argument, and had such facts to enforce it, that the Senate did not dare to take the responsibility of leaving the country in such a distracted state as they found it in at the opening of the 31st Congress. They did not dare to turn away, one point of the compass, from the course which Mr. Clay had indicated. The factious had indeed the satisfaction of being able to say, the bill was defeated. So it was. But they knew too well, that Mr. Clay was not defeated. They knew too well, that nothing remained for them, but to carry out the plan of the Committee of Thirteen, in separate bills. The shifting aspects of the questions, as the result of time and debate, had by this time superseded the necessity of grouping several objects in the same bill. The moral machinery constructed by Mr. Clay, in this long-protracted effort, was obliged to move onward to the grand result, even though he were not there to see to it. His

health had broken down, and he was obliged to leave Washington on the 2d of August, and repaired to Newport, for sea air and bathing.*

* It should be observed, that the measure, or measures, reported by the Committee of Thirteen, consisted of three bills: First, a bill to admit California, to organize the Territories of New Mexico and Utah, and to settle the boundaries of Texas; next, a bill for the recovery of fugitive slaves; and third, a bill to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia. It was the first of these bills, which was first taken up, which occasioned the long debate, and which was passed on the 31st of July, with every thing stricken out, except the organization of a Territorial Government for Utah.

Mr. Clay had said, there are three ways of killing a bill: one by rejecting it on its merits; the second, by amendments; and the third, by speaking against time. This bill was killed by amendments. We have not taken pains to count them; for they were almost countless, running along through the history of the debate. Mr. Benton, for example, would bring in a batch of a baker's dozen at a time, each to be debated and decided *seriatim*. The amendments finally struck out all but Utah.

The reason of the Committee of Thirteen for connecting the Territories, and settling the boundary of Texas, with the admission of California, was to avoid the Wilmot Proviso in the House of Representatives. But the weeks and months of delay and debate, and the death of President Taylor, had produced a changed state of feeling in both branches of Congress. Mr. Clay's argument, from time to time presented, had convinced all, that the measures proposed by the Committee of Thirteen must all be passed, and Mr. Fillmore was not committed, whether they went together, or separately. When, therefore, the first bill of the Committee of Thirteen failed, it failed with the perfect understanding that all its parts would be carried out. It was, therefore, a triumph, not a defeat. The last two bills, regarding the recovery of fugitive slaves, and the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, had not been taken up. It was also understood that these would be passed, and so they were. Mr. Clay had fulfilled his mission, and the state of his health required him to leave for a time. All his resolutions, as originally offered, except those which were merely declaratory, were incorporated in these bills. His triumph, therefore, was complete. Whatever merit attaches to these measures, as finally passed, and whatever of good they brought to the country, had their origin in Mr. Clay's statesman-like conceptions, and were chiefly the fruit of his indefatigable and untiring endeavors. The country was tranquilized, and even the North acquiesced in the fugitive slave bill, though hard to digest. The beneficent results of the Compromise of 1850, would, doubtless, have continued, if the nefarious Kansas-Nebraska bill had not, in 1854, opened all the wounds afresh, and aggravated them a thousand fold.*

* Appendix, Note D. page 354.

CHAPTER IX.

THE COMPROMISE OF 1850.

Mr. Clay the Chieftain.—The Defeat a Victory.—Mr. Clay's Resolutions all carried out.—Mr. Clay's position in the Compromise toward the North and South.—The *lex loci* of the new Territories.—The Virginia Resolutions of '98.—The nature of Compromise legislation.—The obnoxious features of the Fugitive Slave Law.—The Compromises are Covenants.

Although Mr. Clay, after a few weeks' absence at Newport, appeared again in the Senate toward the close of the first session of the 31st Congress, to assist in the consummation of the Compromise of 1850; although he was at his post at the second session of this Congress, and took a somewhat active part in the River and Harbor bill, especially toward the close of the session, to prevent its defeat—though it was defeated by amendments and speaking against time; and although he appeared again for the last time, in the 32d Congress, in a feeble and declining state of health, never to return to Ashland, except in his coffin, he had done the great work, which renders the closing period of his public life memorable, in the first session of the 31st Congress, the details of which are given in the preceding chapters. It has been seen that he was the prime mover, the leading advocate, and the great chieftain of the Compromise of 1850, although he had important coadjutors and auxiliaries in both the two great political parties of the country, headed by Mr. Webster of the Whigs, and General Cass of the Democrats, who merged their party feelings in the sacred cause of restoring peace again between the North and South, and re-establishing public tranquility. But Mr. Clay was the recognized leader. He took the burden of that position on his shoulders, and bore it through in triumph, against such an array of opposition as was never before mustered in the Senate of the United States—an opposition

constantly multiplying its devices and shifting its forms, and persistent to the last. In its dying struggle, it flourished the banner of victory, and seemed to have achieved it. It certainly died with its colors nailed to the mast. But, as we have seen, the bill was lost—all but the territorial government of Utah—only to spring up from the urn containing its ashes, like the fabled phœnix. The momentum which the other parts of it had acquired, by the argument of Mr. Clay, so often renewed and so eloquently sustained, was irresistible. It did not require even his presence for the carrying out of the other parts of this measure, in separate bills, and he had nothing to do with it, except, on his return, to fill out the blank for the compensation of Texas, with $10,000,000, for the surrender of her claims to New Mexico.

Neither the fugitive slave law, nor the bill for the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, was included in the bill which was lost on the 31st of July; for they were reported as separate measures by the Committee of Thirteen, and had not come under debate. A bill for the recovery of fugitive slaves, had been introduced in the early part of the session, and was pending during this long debate on the first measure of the Committee of Thirteen; but, in anticipation of a new form, from the hands of a special committee, it was not debated. The form reported by the Committee of Thirteen, was passed in Mr. Clay's absence. Hence we have little argument from him on that subject, except in the report of the Committee which contained an important amendment, not found in the law, which was designed to secure to the alleged fugitive the right of trial by jury, if he claimed to be a free man. Mr. Clay is alleged to have expressed his regret for the more obnoxious parts of this law, and to have said, that he reluctantly yielded to some of the Southern members of the Committee, in agreeing to them. Being a man of compromise, he was forced to compromise in the Committee. But as we have before seen, from his own words, he was in favor of having this law effective for the accomplishment of the prescribed object of the Constitution, and he would "go as far as the farthest" for that end.

Mr. Clay was present when the bill for the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia was passed, and of course advocated it, so far as necessary, and voted for it.

We have said that all Mr. Clay's resolutions, which were

brought forward by him the 29th of January, were incorporated in the Compromise of 1850, except those which were merely declaratory. The admission of California, which was the subject of the first resolution, was consummated. The first two members of the second resolution, to wit, that "slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced, in any of the territory acquired by the United States," etc., are, as will be seen, merely declaratory; and although Mr. Clay desired they might be affirmed, as a basis for non-action in the way of legislation on slavery in those Territories, they were not reported on by the Committee; but the latter part of the same resolution, recommending the organization of these Territories, was acted on and carried out. The third resolution, regarding the boundary of Texas, and the fourth, touching compensation to Texas for the relinquishment of certain territorial claims, were also carried out in the Compromise. The fifth resolution, that "it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia," was a mere declaration, and it was not acted on. But the sixth, on prohibiting the slave trade in the District, passed into a law. The seventh, on the recovery of fugitive slaves, also passed into a law; but the eighth and last, on the power of Congress over the slave-trade between the States, was merely declaratory, and was not acted on. Every thing, therefore, in Mr. Clay's resolutions, that was a fit subject of positive legislation, was incorporated in the Compromise of 1850, and nothing else. Mr. Bell's resolutions, except so far as they coincided with Mr. Clay's, were not touched.

Here we have renewed and indubitable evidence, not only of the genius of Mr. Clay adapted to such great exigences, but of his statesman-like and unerring sagacity in devising precisely the measures which the state of the nation required, and which he himself, by his eloquence and by his unrivaled tact, could sustain before the Senate, before Congress, and before the nation. He could be opposed—was opposed, skillfully, perseveringly, almost violently—but he could not be baffled. He had the North and the South to contend with, and that, too, in their most violent spasms of political strife. Ofttimes he was forced to fly into the face, into the very jaws, of a cerberus on the one hand, and of a cerberus on the other; and the manner in which he silenced their barkings and howlings, and laid his hand upon the heads of such opponents, subduing their madness and sometimes mak

ing them even kind, is characteristic only of himself. They felt the power of his charm, and gave way to it. His mien, too, as he turned his face toward them, awed them into fear. Armed with truth and right, he was conscious of the strength of his position.

After having fought against the annexation of Texas, and denounced the war with Mexico, as a plan for the extension of slavery, and seeing that the plan was so far accomplished, and the victors stretching out their hand to clutch the prize, it was no small thing to turn and say to them, "You have lost California, and the *lex loci* of the territories acquired from Mexico is against you by the decrees of the Public Law of the civilized world. You cannot enter those territories with your slaves, and I for one will never consent to it." All this, and much more of the same kind, was in the mouth of Mr. Clay, during this long debate, when he spoke to the South.

And what did he say to the North? "If you desire peace, give up your Wilmot Proviso. You have that in your free California, in the *lex loci* of the new Territories, and in the ordinances of nature there, which is worth more than a thousand 'Wilmots.' The Proviso is not a principle, but a means to an end—an end guarantied without it. Waive it for the sake of peace. Let us have our runaway slaves, which the Constitution has pledged to us. Be content not to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia *now*, and we will give you the suppression of the slave-trade there."

In this manner Mr. Clay had to speak to both parties. They understood him. In every thing he said he aimed to be practical; and he never failed to be so. The South understood, and the North understood. It was no time to deal in equivoques, and Mr. Clay never traded in that art. A crisis had come on the country, and it was to be met—must be met.

And Mr. Clay was an old man. He had done with political life, and with political strifes. He had served the country half a century, and conferred more benefit upon it, than he had received honors from it. The score of debt and credit, in a reckoning of this kind, was all in his favor—greatly so. He owed the country nothing but love and fidelity to her interests, and large measures of these were treasured up in his great heart and lofty mind. There was no man in the Senate, or in the country, that occupied a like position, or that was so well en-

titled to speak and to be heard—none that would be entertained with so much deference, respect, and veneration. Of this he could but be partly conscious. He at least understood his rights —such rights as long service, great experience, and venerable age confer. As he himself said, he "stood on the margin of two worlds," to give his poor advice to the present, and to hope in the future. It was rich advice, fraught with good to the present and to future generations.

On account of the permanent practical importance of these questions, it may be useful to reconsider some of the points made by Mr. Clay in his resolutions and in his argument.

First, the *lex loci* of the territories acquired from Mexico, as determined by the abolition of slavery in that republic in 1829. The announcement of this fact by Mr. Clay, supported as it is by historical evidence, is as good as if that branch of his second resolution had been affirmed by the Senate of the United States. Such an affirmation would not have added to its force at all, though it might, and probably would have had some effect on those who were determined not to admit the fact, and who claim the right of taking their slaves into these and other territories. The reasoning of Mr. Clay, based on Public Law, and applied to the *lex loci* of the newly-acquired Territories, is irresistible; and however it may be for a time silenced by the passionate declamation and actual trespass of interested parties, who take their slaves into those Territories, the *lex loci* and the Public Law of the world will ultimately prevail. It is impossible that such a circumscribed and impotent interest should overcome the opinion of mankind. The moral power of wrong, and of a great wrong to the rights of man, must, in the long run, yield to the moral power of right, sustained by the feeling of the civilized world. This latter power is precisely the agency that will vindicate the *lex loci* of the Territories acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Gaudalupe Hidalgo, against the pretensions of any slave-holders that may rush into them, claiming the protection of the Federal Constitution. "You cannot," says Mr. Clay, "point to a part of the Constitution" that will afford such protection. He declares the doctrine an absurdity, and proves it so. For, if the Constitution carries the *lex loci* of the fifteen slave States into the Territories, it must also carry there the *lex loci* of the fifteen free States, to neutralize each other. Moreover, by the same reasoning, it would carry slavery into the free

States! Such was Mr. Clay's method of exposing this absurdity.

The Virginia doctrine of State-rights disposes of this question with equal brevity, which is, if we rightly understand it, that all powers not delegated specifically to the General Government, belong to the States; and that, outside of these powers, the States are sovereign within their respective jurisdictions. It would indeed be a most latitudinarian construction of the Federal Constitution, to make it carry slavery into the Territories, and protect it there. We may ask with Mr. Clay, where is the specific power? "You can not point to it." And can the slave States carry slavery there? Slavery is a creature of municipal law, not of Federal law, and it has vitality only where municipal law imparts it. Beyond the jurisdiction of slave States, there is, there can be, no slavery in the United States, except in the District of Columbia. This is Mr. Clay's doctrine, and he declared, as we have seen, that he would never be responsible for carrying it beyond these limits. In the circumstances in which he was placed, in carrying forward the Compromise of 1850, he seemed to think it incumbent upon him to utter these sentiments, clearly, boldly, emphatically, so that he could not be misunderstood; and he did so. He reiterated it in the ears of the South. Whatever they did, for or against the Compromise, he did not wish them to do any thing with their eyes closed to this great truth, or to its collateral bearings. His language to the South was, the Constitution will protect you, where it has promised to do so, but no where else; and he specified the points of such guaranty as three, to wit, the recognition of the fact of slavery under the municipal laws of the slave States, its right to be represented in Congress, and the right of recovering fugitives. Beyond this the Federal Constitution promised nothing, could do nothing, would do nothing, in behalf of slavery. Mr. Clay said he had always been a disciple of the Virginia Resolutions of '98, and he applied them to this very subject. That Congress had power to legislate slavery into the Territories, Mr. Clay did not deny; he maintained it, though he would never help them to do it. For the same reason he maintained, that Congress had power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, though he did not think it expedient, except upon the contingencies specified in his fifth resolution. But the power of Congress to establish and to abolish slavery in the Territories is one thing,

and the silent operation of the Federal Constitution to carry and protect it there, without any legislation of Congress, is quite another thing. There is no such power as the latter in the Constitution, nor the slightest semblance of it. No attenuated construction of the implication of an implication, could reflect such a shadow. Above all, the Virginia resolutions of '98 interpose their solemn veto.

Although Mr. Clay contemplated a fugitive slave law, as a part of the Compromise measures, and expressed that purpose in one of his resolutions; although he was chairman of the Committee of Thirteen, and reported a bill to that effect; although he said he "would go as far as the furthest," in carrying out the Constitution which guarantied the restoration of fugitive slaves; although he never denied his responsibility as a member and as Chairman of the Committee that reported the bill, nevertheless, Mr. Clay had no hand in drafting the bill, no voice in the discussion upon it, and he was absent when it was passed. In courtesy to Mr. Mason of Virginia, who was a member of the Committee, and who is understood to have drawn up the bill, Mr. Clay reported it as it came from Mr. Mason's hands, with a view, no doubt, of amending it on its passage. But he was absent, from ill health. It is well understood that he felt it was objectionable, and that it would be obnoxious to the people of the free States. He desired to have it effective, but would doubtless have been glad if it had been framed differently, so as to accomplish the object without affording any just ground of complaint with those who would be ready to admit that the Constitution in this particular should be carried out; and although we never talked with Mr. Clay on the subject, we can readily imagine some of those features of the bill, which, as a practical man, he would have been glad to have left out.

Nevertheless, prior to the enactment of the Nebraska-Kansas law of 1854, the people of thirteen or fourteen of the sixteen free States, had very generally acquiesced in the fugitive slave law, and the complaints of the other two or three free States were gradually subsiding. But for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise of 1820, there is every probability that the country would have settled down in peace under the Compromise of 1850. The reader will be interested in perusing the letter in

the Appendix,* from Mr. Clay to sundry citizens of New York, written in October, 1851, on the subject of the Compromise of the year previous, and on the state and prospects of the country at that time. He says: "It was not supposed by the authors and supporters of the Compromise, in the last Congress, that the adoption of the series of measures that composed it, would secure the unanimous concurrence of all. Their reasonable hopes were confined to a great majority of the people of the United States, and their hopes have not been disappointed." This is doubtless a fair statement of the feeling of the country in 1851. It would appear from this letter, that the subject of the greatest concern with Mr. Clay, at that time, was the temper of South Carolina, which induced him to make a somewhat elaborate argument on Nullification and Secession, defining the difference between the two things, and declaring his opinion how they should be treated, if either or both should actually occur. He did not then imagine that there would be any more difficulty with the fugitive slave law in the free States, such as has arisen since the enactment of the Nebraska-Kansas law. Mr. Clay always had great confidence in the loyalty of the free States to the Union, and instead of speaking disrespectfully of their feelings on the subject of slavery, he declares in one of the extracts from his speeches, in the Appendix, that "we all honor them." Mr. Clay was himself an Emancipationist.† But we need not say that he was one of the strongest of Union men, on the basis of the Federal Constitution and laws; and believing, as he did, that the carrying out of the Constitution by a legislation adequate for the recovery of fugitive slaves, was necessary for the preservation of the Union, he advocated the fugitive slave law.

If a Northern man, Mr. Webster, for example, willing to give the South the benefit of the Constitution in this particular, had drawn up this law, he would probably have made it vastly more effective for the object in view, than to have had it done by a Southern man and a slaveholder, who could not appreciate the feelings of the people of the free States, and who was likely to offend them in such a document, even when he did not intend it. Or, if Mr. Clay had done it, it would doubtless have been unexceptionable to all the people of the free

* Page 402. † See his Letter to Mr. Pindell, page 346.

States who acknowledged the obligations of the Constitution. But, Mr. Clay had nothing to do with it, and as we have before stated, he was absent when it was passed; but, being passed, unfortunate as it is in form and in some of its features, he felt obliged to stand by it as one of the Compromise measures which he himself had proposed, and which he regarded as necessary to a general pacification.

In regard to Mr. Clay's views on the subject of introducing slavery, either North or South of the line of 36° 30′, where it did not exist before, we have already cited enough to show them, in the text, and in the appendix. So, also, of his views on the same subject, in application to the Territories acquired from Mexico. In regard to the latter, he said, in reply to Mr. Soulé, of Louisiana, when the Territorial government for New Mexico was in debate:

"If the senator desires, by any indirect means, by any clause which goes beyond its proposed object, by any implication which can result from that clause, to assert, either that slavery exists now in that country (New Mexico), or that it is lawful to carry it there under the Constitution of the United States, I, for one, can not agree to it. If the senator will agree to the modification of the clause, so as to declare that the Territorial legislature shall pass no laws respecting the establishment or exclusion of slavery, I will go for it with pleasure. * * * But I can not agree that, under the Constitution of the United States, there is a right to carry slaves into New Mexico."

Of course, the same principles and reasoning apply to all Territories where slavery does not exist, or has no title of law. Mr. Clay would never allow himself to be misunderstood on this point. His uniform language was, "never, *never*, will I consent to the extension of slavery."

The position of the Compromise measures of our history, is that of the legislation of the country. They are a part of its legislation. But they occupy even a higher position. They are solemn covenants between opposing parties and conflicting interests, by which each party made concessions to the other, for the sake of peace and public tranquillity. Each of these Compromises was a sacrifice on the altar of the country, morally and religiously sacred, ever to be held, not only under the obligations of law, but of good faith—of a faith pledged by the solemn vows of parties in conflict and trouble, and who could be recon-

ciled to each other only by these mutual sacrifices. To repeal ordinary legislation is no breach of faith; but for one side to break up these solemn covenants, without leave of the other, and against the remonstrances of the other, is undermining the very foundations of morality, and striking a fatal blow on the fabric of society.

A Compromise law, such as characterizes the Compromise legislation of this country, is, therefore, of a twofold character. In the first place, it has the common attributes and force of any other law, enacted by the majority, and approved by the Chief magistrate. Such a law may be repealed in the same way in which it was enacted. But a Compromise law has the additional character of a covenant, which elevates it above the common machinery of legislation, and imparts to it a moral obligation, so that it can not be repealed without the consent of the parties in covenant; or if a repeal be forced without such consent, it is a violation of faith, and partakes of the nature of crime against the well-being of society. Such a repeal involves a most serious and grave responsibility, such as no man of sound morals would ever participate in, if he appreciates its character; and he is inexcusable, if he does not appreciate it. The sober voice of history, allied to the conscience of mankind, will only give tongue to the infamy of the transaction, even if the conesquences are not of the gravest character.

Compromise laws are of a like nature with the Federal Constitution—not, indeed, subject to the same conditions of alteration, but hardly less difficult of being altered. They are virtually an addition to the Constitution—a superinduction—not passing under the same name, but having a like force and effect. Some of them may differ in the particular of being limited, as was the Tariff Compromise of 1833. But the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was unlimited—"FOREVER." This is its express declaration. If any one can prove that it is not a covenant, and that it is of the same character, and that it occupies the same position, with all other legislation, then it could be altered or repealed, as any other law may be, by a majority of the national Legislature, without a violation of faith. But if our Compromise laws have the additional character of a covenant, beyond the common character of legislation, then, clearly, the parties to them must be consulted before any alteration can be made, or a repeal enacted.

As Mr. Clay has been called "the man of Compromise," as he inaugurated the principle and established the system, and as Compromise was his last great work, as set forth in these pages, which in its conception, was the greatest and most important Compromise in the history of American legislation, it can hardly be regarded other than pertinent, in the history of his life, to attempt to elucidate the great principle, of the application of which he may be said to be the author, and which constitutes so prominent and so important a part of American history. Whether our interpretation of that principle be correct, the reader will judge; and whether we rightly represent Mr. Clay's view of it, the reader will also judge. But of the fact, that the genius of Mr. Clay, in adaptation to the state of the country at different periods, maugurated that great principle, developed it into form, and, by his agency and influence, incorporated it with American legislation, as a practical and important element, there can be no doubt. We say, it was the fruit of his genius. In every instance in which he employed it, he sprung it on the nation, not as one that lies in wait to catch prey, but as a beneficent agent sent down from heaven, to quiet a great social and political agitation, by means which nothing but a creative genius could have devised. When no one else could see how a constitutional and legal remedy could be found, he touches a secret spring, which puts the whole fabric of the Constitution in motion, for the accomplishment of the desired end; and all is peace again. It is Constitution and law operating in a new form; but the parties to it are charged to remember, that this is not only law, but a covenant that is never to be disturbed within the bounds of its limitation, if limited; and never to be invaded, if unlimited. All accept it on these conditions; and the questions in dispute are considered as forever settled. The disturber of such a Compromise—more especially if he had been a party to it, but in any case—might justly be regarded as an enemy of society. It has never been supposed that an American citizen had a right to move for its repeal, as in a case of ordinary legislation. It would be an assault on the foundations of morality—for it is a covenant.

Some persons, not content with the Compromise legislation of the country, or with a particular part of it, have declared against all compromises of the kind. They have even denounced it as being itself a compromise of principle. Better, they say, to

adhere to a principle, if it be entertained from conviction, than to give it up. But, as Mr. Clay has abundantly shown, in the citations we have made from him on this point, in these pages, there is no principle concerned in these Compromises but that of a mutual concession of material interests for the sake of peace, to prevent greater sacrifices, on one side or the other, or on both ; to prevent, it may be, the shedding of blood by the strife of arms. So far from being a sacrifice, or even compromise, of principle, it is the highest exemplification of Christian precept to make a sacrifice for the sake of peace. In all Mr. Clay's Compromises, the concessions claimed have been reciprocal, and therefore practical, taking man as he is. No one of them was intended to do injustice to either party ; but to make each give up something for a higher and greater good to each. All things considered, it was a profitable bargain, and a fair one.

Look at that admirable Missouri Compromise of 1821, brought about by Mr. Clay. Missouri appeared, and claimed to be admitted as a State of the Union, with an article in her Constitution violative of the Federal Constitution. It seemed to be an insuperable obstacle ; and how did Mr. Clay get over it ? Simply by prescribing that the Legislature of Missouri should, by a formal act, acknowledge the paramount authority of the Constitution of the United States, which, on being officially communicated to the President of the United States, would entitle her to be proclaimed by the President as a member of the Union. And so it was done ; and the obnoxious article of the Missouri State Constitution fell to the ground by her own act. Congress did not continue to insist that Missouri should expunge that article, as a condition of admission into the Union, as it might and would have done but for this Compromise ; but Congress left that demand in abeyance, that is, gave up the point for the time being. It was a concession. But Missouri was to make a concession also, which, being done, the difficulty vanished. No one could find it, and no one could imagine how there should have been any difficulty, so peaceful was the result. Here was no sacrifice of principle in carrying out the principles of Compromise ; but the rule of the Federal Constitution was firmly maintained, and triumphed. It was simply adapting the machinery of the Constitution to the circumstances of the case and to the nature of man ; but it required the genius of Mr. Clay to do it. But if these uncompromising agitators—these sticklers for *principle*, as

they affect to be—had had this business in charge, instead of floating smoothly into peaceful waters, under a serene sky, as did the ship of state on this occasion, under the guiding hand of Mr. Clay, she would have found herself in a stormy sea, threatened with wreck, or plunging down a cataract in quest of destruction.

We have said, elsewhere, that Mr. Clay was a practical man. As such, he was forced, when engaged in works of compromise, to encounter those who opposed every thing of the kind, and who affected to do it on principle. "Let us have the Constitution, let us have right," they would say. "We want no compromise." It was in vain that Mr. Clay replied, "Certainly, you shall have both. At least, there shall be no violation of the Constitution, and no wrong done." It was in vain he told them life itself was a compromise, and all the way through it we are forced to compromise. We compromise every day in our neighborly and social intercourse. Politeness is a system of compromise; a man of the best manners is the best compromiser. That which makes men most agreeable to each other, and life most pleasant, is a rivalship to serve each other at some sacrifice. This, indeed, would be a rude world, if it were not a theater of compromise, in every act of the great drama. And shall this principle of compromise, which operates so well, so beneficently, and which is so grateful, in all conventional modes of intercourse, be repudiated in the machinery of the body politic, where, on account of the rigid character of the fabric, it is most needed to make it work smoothly? When angry passions rage in private life, where the spirit of compromise is wanting, who does not know the unhappy result? But when conflicting interests, in large combination, make the machinery of state "grate harsh thunder," is it then only that the principle of compromise may never be applied, where it is most needed, on account of the magnitude of the interests and the amount of human happiness which are at stake? The Constitution of the United States, hitherto lauded as an unrivaled document of the kind, is a compromise. It could never have been adopted except on that principle; and having owed its existence to it, can it be expected to work well in similar difficulties, if those intrusted with it shall hold in disrespect the vital power that gave it birth and cradled its infancy? Surely it never worked better than in the Missouri Compromise of 1821, above alluded to.

CHAPTER X.

Mr. Clay's Patriotism.—Conspiracy to break down Mr. Clay.—The Secret of his Successes.—Mr. Clay would try the Strength of the Government against Nullification.—Federal Authority paramount.—Who Defeated the Bill.—Mr. Clay goes to Newport.—Is Benefited.—Returns to Washington.—Mr. Clay Exhausted.—His Desire of Home.—Mr. Clay's Predictions in his Raleigh Letter Fullfilled.—Why he went to the Senate this last time.

On the 31st of July, 1850, when the measure reported by Mr. Clay from the Committee of Thirteen, then called the "Omnibus bill," was defeated, Mr. Clay had nobly completed the last great effort of his public life. It was, indeed, the most protracted and the greatest effort he had ever made—one in which his heart was more concerned than in any other. There were menacing clouds of disunion hanging about our political horizon, of such serious aspects, as to excite his profoundest concern. He was now in the last stage of human life, not expecting long to stay in the country he had served so long—and served, as all the world will admit, with great fidelity. Besides that patriotic affection which is natural to a good man in an ordinary position of life, it is reasonable to suppose that Mr. Clay's heart toward his country was like that of an anxious parent toward a child, the care and culture of whom had been the burden of a long life. In the latter case, is not the strength of affection always measured by the solicitude that has been felt? Is it not so with every object of affection that comes within the range of man's or of woman's love? Consider, then, the history of Mr. Clay's life—devoted to public affairs from his youth till more than three score years and ten had rolled over his head. All this while the care of his country, in all that concerned her interests, had been his vocation. True, he had his domestic relations and affections; but these are but the planting-ground, the nursery of those feelings which appertain to public affairs, when the public interests, and honors, and trusts, make a demand upon them. We all know what incessant demand the

American people made on the use of Mr. Clay's talents, from the first buddings of his manhood till the last stage of his life; and how almost incessantly, during this long protracted period, he was engaged in the public service, in the highest and most responsible trusts, in war and in peace, at home and abroad. With the feelings of a man and a patriot—the latter of which he had in no common degree, and it may be added that he was extremely susceptible of the former—it was morally impossible he should not have had them all called forth and all exercised, in a degree corresponding with the ardor of his natural temperament. Always disposed to be frank and fair, he never had any motives to be otherwise, inasmuch as this same frankness and fairness, in the peculiar and captivating way in which they were manifested, always gained for him private and public esteem. His superior personal endowments always opened a way for an influence which must gratify, and, generally, satisfy the ambition of any living man. Mr. Clay was always, to the last, irresistible in his personal sway over the minds of others; and it was never more fully demonstrated than in his conduct of the Compromise measures of 1850. The opposition was factious in some, and determined in all, that went against those measures; some, if not many of his opponents, seemed to be actuated by the feeling that, if Mr. Clay was never beaten before, he shall be beaten now. "We will break him down in his old age, in his last great effort." They tried hard for it, and for a moment they seemed to have succeeded. They were not aware, nobody was aware, on the 31st of July, when Mr. Clay's bill was defeated, what an amazing influence he had wielded over the Senate, over both Houses of Congress, and over the wide country during this long debate; or that that influence must necessarily react, from that moment, to carry through Congress, in great speed, every measure which Mr. Clay had proposed! Such was the result.

The secret of this influence, no doubt, lay in the recognition of Mr. Clay's patriotism in this great effort. In so many forms, during this six months' debate, did it flash out from his undying ardor, so often did his eloquence, as occasion provoked it, awe the Senate into respect, and make even his opponents feel its power, that nothing could do away the impression that had been made. The storm of conflict was, every now and then, broken in upon by the shafts which Mr. Clay wielded, as Jupiter was

fabled to send down his bolts from the heights of Olympus; and every one of them told. The dark cloud reflected back the light that was cast upon it by the flashes of an ever-radiant, burning genius which presided over the agitated elements in the Senate-chamber of the nation. There was no dispute as to the supremacy of this influence. The country felt and acknowledged that "he was the noblest Roman of them all!" At the very moment when his opponents thought to break him down and clip his wings, he soared above them, like the eagle with his eye on the sun.

We repeat, that nothing but the amazing power of feeling residing in the breast of the true patriot, expressed in those eloquent forms which so eminently befitted the occasion that challenged its exercise, could have produced an effect like this. Nor was it the studied eloquence of Demosthenes, poured forth in one day, perhaps in one hour, on an assembled multitude, to carry them all before it, in a passion; but it was the eloquence of a patriot, the pulsations of whose heart were seen, as through a glass, from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, not in fitful spasms, but calm as reason under the guidance of a high tone of moral feeling. Mr. Clay had never in his life descended to the trade and tricks of politicians; and he would not do it in this last hour. It was simple honesty, truth, on a momentous topic—felt to be such—that spoke out; and it was all entertained as that for which it was given. Hence its irresistible effect.

The manner in which Mr. Clay appeared in the Senate, on the first of August, the day after the defeat of his bill, is worthy of special note. Having, in those arduous labors, done what he could to pacify the country, and, being defeated, he was no longer responsible.* Now he looks forward to contingent results. If the Senate should yet pass these same measures, reported by Mr. Clay from the Committee of Thirteen, all might be well. But if any or all of them should fail in either branch of Congress, the consequences threatened were not unlikely to be brought on the country—nullification or secession, and perhaps civil war. Mr. Clay took this opportunity to say that, if nullification should be declared, and carried out by one or more States, or by any portion of the people, he, for one,

* See Appendix, page 389 and onward, for extracts from his speeches on the first of August.

should be for trying the strength of the General Government. He did not allow that the sovereignty of the States implied the right to violate the compact of the Union; or that it extended any further than the use of those powers not ceded to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States. He maintained that the powers thus ceded to the General Government were spread over all the States and Territories of the Union, and that they were supreme in their authority over all the rights and powers of State sovereignties, whenever the latter should come in conflict with the exercise of the former. The Federal authorities, in their appropriate functions, were always present in every State, and they could never be suspended by the action of a State, or of any citizens of a State. The rights of the Federal authorities, within the limits prescribed by the Constitution, are as good as, and no better than, the rights of the States, as determined by the same rule. But Federal laws, in their own appropriate domain, are always paramount, and they are backed by all the powers of the Union. A State could not secede, could not nullify, without interfering with those laws; and consequently, such an act, sustained, or attempted to be sustained, by force, would be insurrection, rebellion, against the common government. It is impossible, therefore, that a State should get out of the Union, except by fighting against the Union and destroying it. This is Mr. Clay's doctrine, that the Union is indissoluble, except by violence, by revolution. Consequently, there can never be a dissolution of the Union by the rights of a party to it; nor, in any probability, by consent of the parties concerned. It can only be by force, against the whole power of the Union; and Mr. Clay declared himself in favor of suppressing any attempt at disunion by all the force that may be required. He wished, on such a contingency, to have the strength of the Government tested; and he had no doubt of the complete triumph of the Union, painful as the test would be. The choice forced upon the General Government by such an insurrection or rebellion, would lie between union at such expense, and the disastrous results of disunion; and Mr. Clay believed the former would be selected. He declared, "that both his voice and arm, enfeebled by age as they were, should be given to vindicate the rights and claims of the Union, and of the entire Union, against any attempts, from whatever quarter, to destroy it. Such a movement," he said,

"would be TREASON, and it should be treated as such." See the extracts from his speeches on this occasion, in the Appendix already referred to.

We find Mr. Clay, therefore, rising in the Senate the very next day after the defeat of the bill on which so much depended, and with all the solemnity and dignity of his manner under such peculiar circumstances, uttering his views of the past, present, and future. As to the past, he had done what he could; as to the present, all knew the condition of things as well as he; and as to the future, he himself was relieved of all responsibility. The Senate had refused to sustain his measures, and he had no others to offer. But he would warn those who meditated raising the standard of disunion, of their perilous undertaking.

Mr. Clay, at this moment, stood in the presence of many senators who, as he knew, sympathized with the doctrine of nullification, and who, as he feared, were seriously meditating such a movement, and only waited for the opportunity—a provocation and justification, as they would say—such as the non-adjustment of the questions thrown overboard the day before. These very men had done all they could to prevent the settlement of those questions, and apparently had succeeded. It is only in the light of these facts that one can appreciate the motives of Mr. Clay in denouncing nullification on this occasion, and in warning those who were more than half ready to venture upon it—who, in opposing him, and defeating his measures, had done all they could to furnish an occasion.

We do not know what faith Mr. Clay had at this moment, that all his measures would be taken up, each by itself, and passed separately, as was afterward done; but we gather from the tone of his remarks on the first of August, that he had his doubts. In those remarks he once alluded to this contingency; but the burden of what he said this day was based on the assumption, that it would not be done. Amendments most ungraciously thrust in at the moment when it was expected the bill would pass, especially those moved by Messrs. Dawson and Pearce—the former, as we suppose, making his support of the bill contingent on his amendment; and the latter, one of its professed friends from the first—defeated the measure. Mr. Clay, doubtless, was chagrined, mortified, discouraged. He came down on Mr. Pearce with dignity, and said, "I make no reproaches;" but he would not allow him to escape from the

responsibility, as will be seen in the extracts we have made in the Appendix.* The bill was lost, and all, apparently, was at sea again. Mr. Clay could do no more. His health was broken down, and he must go to Newport in hope of a resuscitation there. He left Washington the next day. But before he went, he laid hard on the bosom of the Senate the responsibility they had assumed. It was incumbent on them now to do battle with the hideous ghost of nullification, which peered over their shoulders, and menaced the peace of the country. They had many bad spirits to lay, which had passed from the hands of Mr. Clay to theirs. But Mr. Clay had shown them how to do it. There was no other path of rescue. They never tried to find another, but filed into this, as if they had been disciplined to the order; and so they had been. No man dared to strike out a new path, or to propose a new measure, or to reject one of these. We speak, of course, of the majority of the Senate, who had sustained Mr. Clay, and who were still strong enough to carry out his measures. But Mr. Clay did not leave till he had sounded his warning in the ears of the nullifiers, that, so far as he was concerned, the rights and supremacy of the Federal authorities should be maintained, and the country, the world, should know, whether twenty-nine States should yield to one, and whether one should be permitted to break up the solemn compact of the thirty, under which so many blessings had been enjoyed, equally participated in by all. If blood was to be shed in defense of the Union, the responsibility would rest on those who should attempt to disturb it. Washington's administration had to deal with a civil broil of this kind, and blood was shed; but the insurrection was soon put down. So would it be with any attempt at nullification.

On the 2d of August Mr. Clay started for Newport. On the 6th we find him at Philadelphia enjoying the society of his friends.† On the 15th of August he writes to his son, Thomas, from Newport: "They are passing through the Senate all the measures of our Compromise, and if they should pass the House

* It is due to Mr. Pearce to say, that no senator was more zealous than he to pass all the Compromise measures, as they afterward came up. Mr. Pearce was one of the most accomplished scholars in the Senate, and a statesman of no mean type, notwithstanding his modest pretensions, as cited in the Appendix. But we have not been able to justify the part he took in defeating Mr. Clay's bill.

† See Private Correspondence, page 611.

also, I hope they will lead to all the good effects which would have resulted from the adoption of that measure."* He also says: "I have been benefited by my visit to this place, and shall remain here about a week longer." On the 28th of August we find Mr. Clay again in the Senate. He was in time to assist in the passage of the bill for the suppression of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, and to fill up the blank for the compensation to Texas for the relinquishment of some of her territorial claims, which was assigned to him as Chairman of the Committee of Thirteen; and before the close of this session, he had the satisfaction of finding all the measures he had reported from that committee passed by Congress, and approved by the President of the United States, Mr. Fillmore. If General Taylor had lived, there might have been difficulty, as we have before seen. In a letter of the 15th of July, Mr. Clay says: "I think the event that has happened [General Taylor's death] will favor the passage of the Compromise Bill."† Providence overrules all things for good. Mr. Clay firmly believed that all these measures were necessary for the pacification of the country; and they were all passed, substantially as he conceived and framed them, though, as we have seen, the Fugitive Slave Law was not made what he intended it should be, as he was absent when it passed, and it failed of those amendments with which he was charged from the committee. That was the only unfortunate law—unfortunate in form—of the Compromises of 1850.

Having been in Washington a little over a week, on his return from Newport, Mr. Clay wrote to his son, Thomas: "I am again getting very much exhausted. I wish I had remained longer at Newport, where I was very much benefited. I shall return home as soon as possible, where I desire to be more than I ever did in my life."‡

Is it strange that Mr. Clay should have this feeling of desire for home, and "more than ever in his life," considering his age, and the fatigues through which he had passed for the last few months? Is it strange that he should begin to feel exhausted again, now that he had very little to do? He was sustained by the long period of exciting anxiety through which he had passed, as is natural to all persons in like circumstances; but the care and labor are past—nature sinks. Doubtless, Mr. Clay found benefit by his journey to Newport, and by his stay there

* Private Correspondence, p. 612. † Ibid, p. 611. ‡ Ibid, p. 612.

of about three weeks. New faces, exemption from labor, sea air, and sea-bathing, at such a place, were a great change from that constant stretch of mind and senatorial drudgery from which Mr. Clay had escaped ; and more than all, the title which he now had to shake off that weight of responsibility which had so long rested on his shoulders. He had done his duty—he had done all he could do: he had a right to some repose. But no sooner had he returned to Washington, and been there a week, than he began to feel exhausted again, though he had little to do. Perhaps he did not himself understand the cause ; but we can easily see, that the effect of such a long, protracted tension of all his powers, intellectual, moral, and physical, as was put in requisition for that great effort of a leader in the Compromise measures of 1850, would not be transient, nor pass off by a little vacation at Newport. Had Mr. Clay been a young man, it would have been hard enough to bear. But having the weight of more than seventy years on his head, the only wonder is that he did not sink under it entirely the moment it was over.

And there is that desire of home, "more than ever in his life." How natural! Mr. Clay had a delectable home, and those who loved him there. Ashland is not alone a name for poetry, for a whole nation to cherish as the residence of Henry Clay; but since Mr. Clay made it what it is, it has been a delicious retreat from the world.

But there is something more in this desire of home. Mr. Clay was not now a young man, with the tempting field of ambition before him. Ambition was dead in him, except to preserve untarnished the fame he had acquired for services to his country and to mankind. When he bade farewell to the Senate, in 1842, he never intended to appear there again, and nothing would have induced him to do so, but to serve the country in a time of peril. The Mexican war and its conquests had fulfilled all Mr. Clay's predictions, uttered in his Raleigh letter. War had come, as he foretold, and conquest followed. He warned the South, that they would probably be disappointed in their plan of slavery extension, and it was this disappointment that made the trouble which brought Mr. Clay again into the Senate of the United States. A vast territory had been acquired from Mexico with the design of making it a slave country, and thus give a political ascendancy to the slave States in the Congress and government of the United States. California had turned

up a free State, and it was discovered that Mexico had abolished slavery, and consequently, that the *lex loci* of all the countries ceded by Mexico to the United States excluded slavery. In addition to this, the Wilmot Proviso was thrown into the House of Representatives, and had been carried there. It failed in the Senate, and waited only for the admission of California, which would give sixteen free States against fifteen slave States. This was a totally unexpected result, and precisely what Mr. Clay had predicted, in his Raleigh Letter, as a contingent future.

Of course, the whole South rose in arms against the consequences of this disappointment. They would not admit California; they declared that slavery did exist in the territories acquired from Mexico, and that, in any case, the Constitution of the United States would carry and protect it there; and they would dissolve the Union if the Wilmot Proviso should become a law. Nothing could exceed the violence of feeling manifested in the South in sight of these facts; and it was all in consequence of the hasty annexation of Texas, and the Mexican war—a result directly the reverse of the objects of annexation and the war. Mr. Clay had foretold it all contingently and the contingencies were afterward developed in history.

It was in this state of things that Mr. Clay consented to return to the Senate, that, if possible, he might be the instrument of another great compromise, to compose these disturbed elements, these fearful agitations. Nothing but the incentives of such a lofty, patriotic mission could have induced him to turn his back again on the shades of Ashland, and mingle in the storm of such a debate as awaited his advent in the Senate of the United States, at such a time and in such circumstances. But it was the call of his country, we might say of God's High Providence; and he obeyed. We have seen what a work he had to do there, and what he accomplished. Having done this great work, is it a matter of wonder that he should "desire home more than ever in his life?"

As soon as this session of Congress adjourned, on the 30th of September, Mr. Clay repaired to Ashland.

CHAPTER XI.

Continued agitation.—Declaration and Pledge, headed by Mr. Clay, against the Agitators.—Effect thereof.—Mr. Clay's Proposal to Amend the Tariff of 1846.—Mr. Clay a practical and national man.—"I know no North, no South, no East, no West."—Mr. Clay's efforts for the River and Harbor bill defeated for want of the Previous Question.—His last battle.

Mr. Clay, doubtless, enjoyed the repose of Ashland—certainly he needed it—during the short recess from the close of the first to the beginning of the second session of the thirty-first Congress, which was only two months. He, however, extended it to the middle, the sixteenth of December, before he took his seat in the Senate. Why did he not resign, as he had done the work for which he consented to go to the Senate? That work was not yet complete; for loud discontents came from various quarters in relation to the Compromise—especially from the free States, which were greatly dissatisfied with the Fugitive Slave Law. Neither had the South fully acquiesced in the settlement. Much more of influence, in some form, remained to be employed, to compose these discontents. Disappointed politicians, North and South, were still agitating, and trying to agitate the questions settled by the Compromise. It was on this account that the following paper was drawn up, and signed by forty-four members of Congress—from both Houses—Mr. Clay's signature being at the head:

"The undersigned, members of the thirty-first Congress of the United States, believing that a renewal of sectional controversy upon the subject of slavery, would be both dangerous to the Union and destructive of its peace, and seeing no mode by which such controversies can be avoided, except by a stout adherence to the settlement thereof effected by the Compromise passed at the last session of Congress, do hereby declare their intention to maintain the said settlement inviolate, and to resist all attempts to repeal or alter the acts aforesaid, unless by the general consent of the friends of the measure, and to remedy such evils, if any,

as time and experience may develop. And for the purpose of making this resolution effective, they further declare, that they will not support, for the office of President or Vice President, or of senator or of representative in Congress, or as member of a State Legislature, any man, of whatever party, who is not known to be opposed to the disturbance aforesaid, and to the renewal, in any form, of agitation upon the subject of slavery hereafter. Washington, January 22, 1851."

In this form, and with forty-four names of the leading members of Congress, this Declaration and Pledge went forth to the public. What influence it had it is impossible to say, because such influence can never be estimated. But it was a rebuke to agitators, and it could hardly have failed of its intended effect. Some complained of it, as an abridgment of the freedom of speech, and of opinion; but they might still think and say what they should please; and the only penalty was, that "we, the subscribers, and all within the scope of our influence, shall regard you as disturbers of the public tranquillity, and we will not intrust you with the keeping of it." It was, doubtless, a combination, so far. It has that character on the face of it; it virtually professed to be such; and the occasion for it was regarded as a befitting one. All who act for the good of society, *combine*, in one form or another. They could accomplish little if they did not. The form is an accident; it is the object that makes it meritorious or otherwise. And who will say that the object of this paper was not worthy of those who signed it—even of that great name which stands at the head of the list? If the Compromise, as a whole, was a happy settlement of the difficulties in which the country had been involved, to guard it from violation, and to endeavor to check all attempts at its violation, was worthy of those who had taken so much pains to bring it about.

Mr. Clay, who had begun life, and passed through it, as the consistent and unflinching advocate of American arts, industry, and labor, against the rivalship of cheap, foreign labor—so cheap that American labor could not compete with it without a sacrifice of its rights, without coming down to the same level of pauperism—should not be expected to lose any opportunity that presented, of a hopeful character, to renew his efforts in that cause. He had observed, with great anxiety, the fearful inroads

which the Tariff of 1846 had made on the rights of American labor, and what destruction it had wrought in many of the great interests of the country. In presenting some petitions in behalf of our languishing manufactures, on the 22d of December, Mr. Clay said:

"Mr. President—I will take occasion to say that I do hope that now, when there is an apparent calmness upon the surface of public affairs—which I hope is real, and that it will remain without disturbing the deliberations of Congress during the present session—for one, I should be extremely delighted if the subject of the Tariff of 1846 could be taken up in a liberal, kind, and national spirit; not with any purpose of reviving those high rates of protection which at former periods of our country were established for various causes, sometimes from sinister causes, but to look deliberately at the operations of the Tariff of 1846; and, without disturbing its essential provisions, I should like a consideration to be given to the question of the prevention of frauds and great abuses, of the existence of which there can be no earthly doubt. Whether some suitable legislation can not take place for that purpose, ought to be deliberately considered. We should see whether we can not, without injury, without prejudice to the general interests of the country, give some better protection to the manufacturing interests than is now afforded.

"The fact is no longer doubtful that the fires are extinguished and extinguishing daily in the furnaces of the country. The fact is no longer doubtful that the spindles and looms are daily stopping in the country. Whether it is possible to arrest this downward course, and to throw a little spirit of hope and encouragement into this great industrial interest without agitating the country generally, and without any extravagance of legislation, are questions, I think, very well worthy of serious consideration; and I hope, in the calm which we are at present allowed to enjoy in relation to other great topics which have so long and so disastrously agitated the country, that, at some early period during the present session, this subject will be taken up and dealt with in a spirit of kindness, and harmony, and nationality."

Who will deny that Mr. Clay was always a practical, a national man? He was practical in this case, because, knowing that he could not, in any probability, get all that he wanted, and which he might think best for the interests of the country, he would take what he could get—even the crumbs that fell from the rich manufacturer's table in Europe, who is made rich by the wrongs done to American labor. He asked only so to amend the Tariff as to prevent the great frauds practiced under

its administration, and to give some help to those manufactures, which were rapidly going out of existence for want of a moderate protection, and in which a vast amount of American capital was invested. Knowing well the impossibility of effecting any thing by reasoning with such minds as could be satisfied with the Tariff of 1846, and that the majority of Congress—certainly of the Senate—would refuse to make any essential alterations in that law, he prays them to do that which could so easily be proved to be wanting, and which must be so obvious to themselves. He condescends to employ even a supplicatory tone—"I do hope." He would not do that for himself; but he was pleading for the country.

And Mr. Clay was a national man. In the Senate, February 14, 1850, Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, had lectured Mr. Clay somewhat, by implication, on that allegiance which he [Mr. Clay] owed to the South, as a senator from a Southern or slave State. It was in reply to this that Mr. Clay uttered the memorable and oft-quoted words, "I know no South, no North," etc.

Mr. Clay said: "It is totally unnecessary for the gentleman to remind me of my coming from a slaveholding State. I know whence I came, and I know my duty; and I am ready to submit to any responsibility which belongs to me as a senator from a slaveholding State. Sir, I have heard something said on this and on a former occasion about allegiance to the South. I KNOW NO SOUTH, NO NORTH, NO EAST, NO WEST, to which I owe any allegiance. I owe allegiance to two sovereignties, and only two; one is to the sovereignty of this Union, and the other is to the sovereignty of the State of Kentucky. My allegiance is to this American Union and to my own State. But if gentlemen suppose that they can exact from me an acknowledgment of allegiance to any ideal or future contemplated confederacy of the South, I HERE DECLARE that I owe no allegiance to it, nor will I, for one, come under any such allegiance, if I can avoid it. I know what my duties are; and gentlemen may cease to remind me of the fact, that I come from a slaveholding State."

Have we not just emerged from the history of the Compromise of 1850? and was not Mr. Clay a national man in all that? When, on what occasion, as a public man and as a statesman, did he ever circumscribe his views to one State, or to one section of the country? and, on all fitting occasions, he carried out his views to the wide world; for, as a nation, we have

relations to all the world. We see, in the above cited colloquy between him and Mr. Foote, how indignantly he scorned the imputation of owing allegiance to the South, and yet no man in the country ever stood up stronger than he for the just rights of the South. He did not measure his duty to the South by Southern views, peculiarly such, but by his loyalty to the whole Union.

The River and Harbor bill of this session, which was of very great importance to the country, and which had passed the House of Representatives by the decided majority of 103 to 87, was reported to the Senate on the 25th of February, and was called up the first of March, only three days before the close of the session– one of which was Sunday. Mr. Clay took a very great interest in this bill, as it is known he always did in all measures for internal improvements. If it could have been brought to a vote in the Senate it would have passed. But it was soon found that the opponents of the bill, though a minority, were acting in concert to kill it by Parliamentary tactics. It is a pity that the previous question was not a rule of the Senate, as it is of the House of Representatives, to enable a majority to carry out its own objects in spite of a factious minority. We have seen how much Mr. Clay felt the importance of that rule during the Compromise debate of the previous session. It would have saved months of time, and a corresponding expense to the country. When Mr. Clay discovered this disposition in the minority, he rose and said: "I wish to say one or two words only. I hope the friends of the bill—its *real* friends—will insist upon immediate action. It is now or never for the bill"—this day, or never; for there were other bills of great importance pending; the Civil and Diplomatic Appropriation bill, the Navy and Army Bills, which must, of necessity, be passed during the remaining three days, and they ought not to be acted upon without time for consideration in detail. But the preconcerted game of amendments and of speeches commenced. After several speeches were made against the bill, Mr. Clay said:

"There are three modes of killing a bill. One is by meeting it boldly, straightforward, coming up to the mark, and rejecting it. Another is by amendments upon amendments, trying to make it better than it was. Of course I do not speak of the motives of senators in offering the present amendments. I speak

of the effect, which is just as certain, if these amendments are adopted, as if the bill were rejected by a vote against its passage. A third mode is to speak against time when there is very little time left.

"Sir, I have risen to say to the friends of this bill, that if they desire it to pass, I trust they will vote with me against *all* amendments, and come to as speedy and rapid action as possible. Under the idea of an amendment, you will gain nothing. I think it likely there are some items that should not be in the bill: and can you expect in any human work, where there are forty or fifty items to be passed upon, to find perfection? If you do, you expect what never was done, and what you will never see. I shall vote for the bill for the sake of the good that is in it, and not against it on account of the bad it happens to contain. I am willing to take it as a man takes his wife, 'for better for worse,' believing we shall be much more happy with it than without it.

"An honorable senator has gotten up and told us that here is an appropriation of $2,300,000. Do you not recollect that for the last four or five years there have been *no* appropriations at all upon this subject? Look at the ordinary appropriation, in 1837, of $1,307,000; for it is a most remarkable fact that those administrations most hostile to the doctrine of Internal Improvements have been precisely those in which the most lavish expenditures have been made. Thus we are told, this morning, that there were five, six, or eight hundred thousand dollars during General Jackson's administration, and $1,300,000 during the first year of Mr. Van Buren's. Now, there has been no appropriation during the last three or four years, and, in consequence of this delinquency and neglect on the part of Congress heretofore, because some $2,300,000 are to be appropriated by this bill, we are to be startled by the financial horrors and difficulties which have been presented, and driven from the duty which we ought to pursue. With regard to the appropriations made for that portion of the country from which I come—the great Valley of the Mississippi—I will say that we are a reasoning people, a feeling people, and a contrasting people; and how long will it be before the people of this vast valley will rise *en masse* and trample down your little hair-splitting distinctions about what is national, and demand what is just and fair, on the part of this government, in relation to their great interests? The Mississippi, with all its tributaries—the Red, Wabash, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Ohio rivers—constitute a part of a great system, and if that system be not national, I should like to know one that is national. We are told here that a little work, great in its value, one for which I shall vote with great pleasure—the breakwater in the little State of Delaware—is a great national work, while a work which has for its object the improvement

of that vast system of rivers which constitute the Valley of the Mississippi, which is to save millions and millions of property and many human lives, is not a work to be done, because it is not national! Why, look at the appropriations. Here was our young sister, California, admitted but the other day; $1,500,000 for a basin there to improve her facilities, and how much more for Custom-houses? Four or five hundred thousand dollars more in that single State for two objects than the totality of the sum proposed to be appropriated here. Around the margin of the coast of the Atlantic, the Mexican Gulf, and the Pacific coast, everywhere we pour out, in boundless and unmeasured streams, the treasures of the United States, but none to the interior of the West, the Valley of the Mississippi—every cent is contested and denied for that object. Will not our people draw the contrast? Talk about commerce! we have all sorts of commerce. I have no hesitation in saying that the domestic commerce of the Lakes and the Valley of the Mississippi—is greatly superior in magnitude and importance to all the foreign commerce of the country, for which these vast expenditures are made. Sir, I call upon the North-western senators, upon Western senators, upon Eastern senators, upon senators from all quarters of the Union, to recollect that we are parts of one common country, and that we can not endure to see, from month to month, from day to day, in consequence of the existence of snags in the Mississippi, which can be removed at a trifling expense, hundreds of lives and millions of property destroyed, in consequence of the destruction of the boats navigating those rivers, for the want of some little application of the means of our common government.

"I do not say that these people will be driven to any great and important action, threatening the integrity of the Union. No, sir; they will stand by this Union under all circumstances; they will support it, they will defend it, they will fly anywhere and everywhere to support it; but they will not endure much longer this partial, limited, exclusive appropriation of the public revenue of the country to this mere margin of the country, without doing any thing for that interior which equals nearly, if it does not entirely constitute a moiety, of the population of the country.

"Mr. President, I have been drawn into these remarks very irregularly, I admit. I am delighted to see some of my Democratic friends breaking the miserable trammels of party. Nationality! Is not that a national improvement which contributes to the national power, whether the improvement be in the little State of Delaware, or in the great valley of the Mississippi river? What makes it harder, especially in regard to the Mississippi river, is, that from the vast body of water, it is impossible to make any great national improvement. All that can be done is to make small annual improvements, by clearing out

trees from that great national highway—to take up the annual snags which form themselves in the river. It requires constant and incessant application of means in order to keep the stream clear. I have been drawn into these observations contrary to any purpose I had. Here is the measure before us. If gentlemen choose to exhaust the remainder of the session in useless amendments, the effect of which is to destroy the bill; if they choose to exhaust the session in speeches made from time to time, let them not charge *us* with defeating the appropriation bill. We are ready—for one, I am ready—to pass upon it item by item, and then take up the appropriation bill and do the same thing with regard to it."

The day and evening (Saturday) were consumed, chiefly by the opponents of the bill, until 12 o'clock, midnight came, and General Cass moved an adjournment, as it was the Sabbath, which prevailed.

On Monday morning, the last day of the session, Mr. Clay said:

"Mr. President, I rise to make a motion to dispense with the morning business, and previous orders, in order to proceed with the unfinished business which was left in that state on Saturday last; and, while I am up, I beg leave, not to make a speech—for I should consider him worthy of almost any punishment who should make a speech on this day—but to say it is manifest to the Senate, and to the country, that there is a majority in this body in favor of the passage of that bill; and I wish to appeal to the justice, to the generosity, to the fairness of the minority, to say whether they will, if they have the power—as I know they have the power—defeat the bill by measures of delay and procrastination? If they are determined to do it, although such a determination is incompatible with the genius of all free governments, and I should hope, also, incompatible with the sense of propriety which each individual member must feel—if there is a determination upon the part of the minority to defeat the bill, by measures to which they have the power to resort, but I am loth to believe they would use them—if there is such a determination, and they will avow it, for one, as I think it of the utmost importance that great measures connected with the operations and continuance of the Government—measures of appropriation—should be adopted, notwithstanding the pain which I should feel in being obliged to submit to the action of a minority, intending to defeat the will of a majority—if such is the avowed purpose, I will myself vote for the laying this bill upon the table. I hope there will be no such purpose. I trust that we shall take up the bill and vote upon it; and I implore its friends, if they desire to pass it, to say not one word, but come to the vote upon it."

But no one of the minority had the hardihood to confess that such was their purpose; but they recommenced the game. After much more precious time had been wasted, Mr. Clay rose and said:

"I at least will not be guilty of losing this or any other measure by speaking to-day. I have risen simply to call for the Yeas and Nays on the motion, and if there be really a majority against the bill in its present shape, I hope they will lay it on the table."

The vote for Mr. Clay's motion to take up the bill, was 30 Yeas, and 25 Nays, it being probably about a fair showing of the majority in favor of the bill.

Amendments and speeches recommenced, every vote showing a decided majority for the bill. But the minority continued the same tactics till 12 o'clock at night of the 3d of March! During this discussion Mr. Clay made the following remarks:

"I came to the Senate this morning, and I said that I would move to take up the bill now under consideration; but that if the minority who oppose the bill would say that, in the exercise of their parliamentary rights, they intended to resist to the utmost its passage, I would not insist upon it. I wanted an avowal; no such avowal was made. We have gone on to this time, and in what manner, the journal of our proceedings will show. The question which this day's proceedings presents is, whether the majority or the minority shall govern. No one has attempted to deprive the minority of any rights appertaining to them. I hope the other portion of this body, the majority, have their rights also, and the great question, that question which lies at the bottom of all free institutions is, whether the majority or the minority shall govern? Upon the issue of that question, I for one, am ready to go before the country and abide their decision."

Then came on a discussion whether the Senate could act constitutionally and legally after twelve o'clock of the night, when the 3d of March ended and the 4th commenced; and it was finally decided, that they might act, as a legislative branch of the Government, till twelve o'clock, M., of the 4th, which every one knew before.

Mr. Clay was exhausted, and went to his lodgings for repose. The debate, however, went on till four o'clock, when a motion to adjourn it to eight in the morning, prevailed, in order to take up the appropriation bills. Mr. Clay, having been advised of

this adjourned debate, was in his place at eight o'clock; but the Appropriation bills took all the remaining hours till noon, and the River and Harbor Bill was lost by the factious and unscrupulous conduct of a minority, in violation of the purpose of a free government, in which a majority is expected to rule.

The Whig party at this time numbered much less than half of the Senate. But the country was in favor of this measure, and many of the Democrats were afraid to vote, especially the candidates for the Presideney. But Mr. Clay's personal influence was great, and nothing could have defeated the bill but the dishonorable mode adopted—which shows the importance of the previous question in the Senate of the United States, since it has fallen from that dignified character, when the honor of its members—which was appealed to on this occasion by Mr. Clay —might be relied upon not to defeat a majority by tricks of a minority.

As this was the last legislative measure in which Mr. Clay took a prominent part, it was suitable that he should pass from this theater, where he had enacted so brilliant and influential a part for nearly half a century, pleading the cause of internal improvements, which had been one of the great purposes of his long public career, and in which he never relaxed his zeal or his energy, and he always had the people on his side. True, he did not always have a majority in Congress; for there were many other issues artfully kept before the people by party tactics, which prevented it. But, as we have seen, with a strong party majority in the Senate against him, the River and Harbor Bill of this session would have passed, but for the unworthy mode of opposition adopted. It was on this occasion that Mr. Clay fought his last battle of public life. All honor to his splendid career!

CHAPTER XII.

Close of Thirty-first Congress.—Mr. Clay rejects "Constructive Mileage."—His Opposition to it.—Mr. Clay's Lungs Injured.—Cough.—Returns to Ashland by way of Cuba.—Correspondence with Judge Beatty.—Health poor.—Mr. Clay Apprehends the Secession Question in Congress.—The Gold Medal to Mr. Clay.—Increasing Illness.—His Reception of Kossuth.

We have done with Mr. Clay for the Thirty-first Congress, which had finished its term the 4th of March, 1851. There was a called session of the Senate of the Thirty-second Congress for Executive business, which convened on the 5th of March. Those senators whose terms of service had not expired with the Thirty-first Congress, and those who were re-elected, were, of course, on the ground. To the consciences and patriotism of all these, the old question of "constructive mileage" applied on this occasion—that is, whether they should be paid for a journey they had never performed? The law of mileage for members of Congress, was designed to pay their expenses of travel in going to Congress and returning. As Congress made the law, it is, of course, a liberal provision, the excess of which, above the actual cost, is often many times the cost. A senator from California is entitled by this law to five thousand dollars for traveling expenses to and fro, whereas the actual cost must be considerably within a thousand dollars; and a senator from Oregon, when it comes to be a State, ought to be a rich man, with his other pay of sixteen dollars per day for each session. Of course, the law was never intended to pay this mileage to senators who stay over a week or ten days for Executive business at the expiration of a Congress. Nevertheless, the law has been so construed; and mileage has been allowed for this called session of the Senate, to those members who were not ashamed to take it. For this called session, beginning the 5th of March, 1851, about forty thousand dollars were paid out of the public treasury for mileage, not a mile of which was ever traveled. Mr. Gwin, of California, received over five thousand dollars; and other senat-

ors from remote States received from fifteen hundred to three thousand dollars. We are happy to be able to say that Mr. Clay was not the only senator that scorned to receive "constructive mileage;" nor would Mr. Clay make out his own mileage for the increased distance of the new methods of public conveyance, as the law entitled him to do, inasmuch as these carried him both quicker and cheaper than the old methods. Such conscientiousness in public men is worthy of imitation. How can reform in public expenditures be expected, when those who alone are invested with power to carry such reform into effect, will thrust their own hands into the public treasury, to take out that which they have never earned, for which they render no consideration, and which does not belong to them, except by an unwarrantable construction of a law made by themselves? And these men are senators of the United States!

An attempt was made in the Senate to reject the nomination of the Hon. Elisha Whittlesy, as Comptroller of the United States Treasury, because he had scruples about allowing this account of "Constructive Mileage;" but Mr. Clay, as might be expected, met this attempt with indignant rebuke. Should a man be rejected from office because he is honest—one of the chief and prescribed qualifications?

The cough which finally carried Mr. Clay out of the world, had commenced its havoc on his constitution during the winter of 1850 and '51, and he was advised to return to Ashland by way of Cuba. He writes Mrs. Clay, under date of

"Washington, March 8th, 1851.

"My Dear Wife.—I have finally concluded to return by Cuba and New Orleans. The greatest difficulty I felt in coming to this conclusion, has been my long absence from you, and my desire to be with you. But my cough continues. Although I do not lay up, my health is bad, and the weather has been the worst of March weather. The road, too, by Cumberland, I am told, is almost impassable. I hope that I may be benefited by the softer climate of Cuba. I expect to go on the 11th, from New York, in the steamer Georgia; and I think my absence from home will not be prolonged beyond a month, that is, the middle of April."*

On the 28th of April, we find him writing from Ashland to Judge Beatty, a long and tried friend. It was in reply to two letters transmitted to Mr. Clay by the judge, on the subject of

* Private Correspondence, page 615.

the nomination of 1848. The following extract may be interesting: "The nomination made of General Taylor, in Philadelphia, has now no other than an historical interest. It has long ceased to affect me. I fear, indeed, that it has had a pernicious influence upon the Whig cause; but of that we shall hereafter be able to judge better. I concur entirely in the views presented in your reply to ———. Had I been nominated, I am perfectly confident that I should have obtained every electoral vote which he received, and besides them, the vote of Ohio certainly, and that of Indiana probably. My majority in Pennsylvania would have been greater than that which was given to him. But the thing is passed, and no one has more quietly submitted to the event than I have."*

To his son James he writes, May 9, 1851: "My health is not good. A troublesome and inconvenient cough has hung by me for six months past. It has reduced and enfeebled me very much. Dr. Dudley thinks that my lungs are unaffected, and that it proceeds from some derangement in the functions of the stomach. Be that as it may, I must get rid of the cough, or it will dispose of me. My hopes rest upon the effects of warm weather."†

The following extract from a letter of Mr. Clay, addressed to Daniel Ullmann Esq., of New York, dated at Ashland, June 14, 1851, verifies what we have elsewhere recorded in the text, and in the Appendix, on that point: "Besides pre-existing questions, a new one will probably arise at the next session of Congress, involving the right of any one of the States of the Union, upon its own separate will and pleasure, to secede from the residue, and become a distinct and independent power. The decision of that momentous question can not but exert some influence, more or less, upon the next Presidential election. For my own part, I utterly deny the existence of any such right, and I think an attempt to exercise it ought to be resisted to the last extremity. For it is, in part, a question of Union or no Union."‡

We find another notice of this subject, from Mr. Clay's hand, in a letter to S. A. Allibone, Esq., of Philadelphia, dated June 30, 1851, which says: "I have no doubt, with you, that many of the quiet and well-disposed citizens of South Carolina are opposed to the measures of violence which are threatened by

* Private Correspondence, page 615. † Ibid., page 616.
‡ Ibid., page 617.

others. But the danger is, as history shows too often happens, that the bold, the daring, the violent, will get the control, and push their measures to a fatal extreme. Should the State resolve to secede, it will present a new form of trial to our system. But I entertain undoubting confidence that it will come out of it with triumphant success."*

As Mr. Clay had occasion, during the debate on the Compromise of 1850, frequently to allude to this subject, and to express his sentiments upon it very decidedly, and as it was a subject on which he felt the profoundest concern—a concern of precisely the same character as that which induced him to consent to go to the Senate again in 1849—he could not, of course, feel, that the time had come for him to resign. We need go no further for a reason of his continuing in the Senate. While he had strength to go to Washington, and to speak there, he would have been unloyal to his country if he had vacated his seat before this remaining cloud had passed over.

The following is from the same letter to Mr. Ullmann, above referred to: "You inquire if I will visit Newport this summer, with a view of ascertaining whether it might not be convenient there, or at some other Eastern place, to present me with a gold medal which, I understand, my good friends are preparing for me. I have been absent from home fifteen out of the last nineteen months, and I feel great reluctance to leaving it during the present summer. If I were to go to the eastward, I should have to return early in the autumn, and soon after to go back to Washington, unless I resign my seat in the Senate of the United States. Under these circumstances my present inclination is to remain at home and attend to my private affairs, which need my care. Should my friends persevere in their purpose of presenting me the proposed medal, some suitable time and place can be hereafter designated for that purpose. Surely no man was ever blessed with more ardent and devoted friends than I am, and among them, none are more, or, perhaps, so enthusiastic as those in the city of New York. God bless them. I wish it were in my power to testify my gratitude to them in full accordance with the fervent impulses of my heart."

"God bless them." We need not say that this was a spontaneous gush of affection, and a fervent prayer. It was not in Mr. Clay to write so if he did not feel so. He had passed the

* Private Correspondence, page 620.

bounds of all earthly ambition, and his friends never expected any thing from his hands as a man in place and power. This he knew; and yet his friends were ambitious to do him honor. We have witnessed Mr. Clay's emotions on more than one touching occasion, and we know how he felt when he wrote these lines.

The medal above alluded to, was presented to Mr. Clay on the 9th of February, 1852, in his own sick chamber, at Washington. On one side is presented his head in profile, brought out in strong relief; and on the reverse the following inscription appears: "Senate, 1806. Speaker, 1811. War of 1812 with Great Britain. Ghent, 1814. Spanish America, 1822. Missouri Compromise, 1821. American System, 1824. Greece, 1824. Secretary of State, 1825. Panama Instructions, 1826. Tariff Compromise, 1833. Public Domain, 1833—1841. Peace with France preserved, 1835. Compromise, 1850."

Of course it is unnecessary to say, that the events indicated in this inscription are those in which Mr. Clay was more especially conspicuous, and in some of which he acquired immortal renown. Any one of them, indeed, lifts him far above the head of his cotemporaries, and is a sufficient foundation for historical fame. It is a small chapter that can go on the face of a medal; but even this is a great chapter.

A descriptive and more particular account of this medal will be found in the volume of Private Correspondence.* Also a letter from Mr. Clay, regarding the events indicated on the reverse of the medal.† This letter was from Ashland, dated the 26th of September, in which he speaks of his "slowly improving health," and expresses the hope, that he will be able to attend the ensuing session of Congress.

We see, by the above notices of his correspondence, that Mr. Clay spent his summer at Ashland, where, doubtless, he realized all the benefits of such repose, which his impaired health would permit. It is sufficiently obvious, however, that his vital energies had been seriously invaded. Still he would live and act for his country. It was in the autumn of this year that he addressed an elaborate letter to certain citizens of New York, on the importance of sustaining the Compromise measures of 1850, which will be found in the Appendix.‡

* Page 622. † Page 620. ‡ Page 402.

Mr. Clay went to Washington at the opening of the Thirty-second Congress; but the days of his public life were numbered. He was unable to take his seat in the Senate, except for once, when he made a few remarks on an unimportant point, and never more lifted up his voice in that chamber, which, for nearly half a century, had from time to time resounded with his eloquence. But a great light of the American hemisphere still lingered above the horizon. As a statesman, he had done with life; and as a Christian, he now prepared to die.

"That constitution," said one of his physicians, who was called from a distance, and most eminent in his profession, to consult in Mr. Clay's last illness; "that constitution was made for ninety years; but it has been overtasked. It can never be braced up again, but must fall." He alluded more especially to the cares and toils of the first session of the Thirty-first Congress, not ignoring the great and unavoidable anxieties of a statesman in Mr. Clay's position—and such a statesman, always conscientious, and never able to divest himself of solicitude for his country. And so Mr. Clay fell a martyr. Doubtless he did; and persecution itself had to do with it. He fought great battles of life, and was never without opponents. He found faithful friends, and uncompromising enemies, throughout his entire career. A magnanimous foe he honored; because, in such a one, he encountered his own image. It was a reflection of himself from a glass; and so far as he was conscious of having that feeling—and he could but know he had it—he looked upon it with complacency. But, alas! magnanimity and fairness, in the strifes of the political arena, are rare endowments of the competitors. "All 's fair in politics!" What a maxim! a maxim that ought ever to scorch the lips of him who should dare to utter it! What a hero must he be, who could bear up under such persecutions as Mr. Clay had to brave in the former part of his career, and look calmly on perfidy directed against himself, without complaint! But treason, and care, and toil broke him down at last. He fell before he ought to have fallen. "He was made for ninety years."

Mr. Clay's family, having heard of his illness, became anxious, and his son Thomas, and wife, immediately offered their services. The following are extracts from Mr. Clay's letter in reply. The letter was addressed to Mrs. Clay, his daughter-in-law, and is dated at Washington, December 25th: "I am under very great obligations, my dear Mary, to you and to

Thomas for the kind offer you have made, to come, either one or both of you, to Washington to attend me during my present illness. If there were the least occasion for it, I should with pleasure accept the offer. But there is not. Every want, every attention which I need, is supplied. * * * If I can get rid of this distressing cough, or can materially relieve it, I may yet be restored to a comfortable condition. That is the present aim of my physicians. But if the cough can not be stopped, or considerably reduced, * * * I may linger along for some months—long enough, possibly, to reach home once more. * * * Under these circumstances, I have no desire to bring any member of my family from home, when there is not the least necessity for it."*

An old acquaintance saw him about this time, or not long after, and wrote as follows: "His state was even worse than I had feared. He was already emaciated, a prey to a severe and distressing cough, and he complained of spells of difficult breathing. I think no physician would have judged him likely to live two months longer. Yet his mind was unclouded and brilliant as ever; his aspirations for his country's welfare as ardent; and though all personal ambition had long been banished, his interest in the events and impulses of the day was in nowise diminished."

The course of events, in the autumn of 1851, tossed upon our shores the great Hungarian patriot, Kossuth. He landed at New York, and set our world on fire by his eloquent appeals to American sentiment and sympathy. Encouraged by his enthusiastic reception, he went a little too far in his interpretations of Public Law, of the maxims of Washington, and in his expositions of the long-established policy of the American Republic. He would not only have us embark in a crusade against all the powers of Europe, but he undertook to show that our principles, as set forth by the founders of the republic, and as stamped on the face of our history, required it. American sympathy for the unfortunate Hungarians carried away the people at the first onset of this eminent apostle of freedom, and they seemed almost *en masse* driving loose from the fast-anchored platform laid by the hands of Washington and his compatriots.

Mr. Clay looked out from his sick chamber at Washington on

* Private Correspondence, page 623.

this new spectacle and was filled with concern. His battles for *American* freedom, and for the freedom of mankind, had not even yet ended; for he was to meet, face to face, this burning zealot, this flashing meteor of European republicanism, sound at heart, doubtless, but urged on to desperation by the misfortunes of his fatherland. How should he meet him? All his words, on such an occasion, would be laid under the eye of the American people, as prophetic advice coming back, as it were, from the tomb; certainly uttered by a recognized oracle, standing in the door of that great receptacle of humanity, about to enter in; with one hand on its jarring folds, and with the other beckoning to his countrymen tarrying behind. He sympathized with Hungary profoundly; he loved the patriot martyr who was about to come into his presence, for his sacrifices and devotion in the cause of freedom; but he loved his own country more, and had tugged too long in the harness of her service to be willing that the precious burden borne along should fall down over broken wheels, or be wrecked in the mire. He had been too long a high officer in the ship of State, to consent that her course should be altered by hands unaccustomed to her tackle, or by counsels alike unacquainted with her commission, and her chart, and her sailing orders. But he wished to receive the self-sacrificing patriot with hospitality, with sympathy, with kindness. He was bound to throw a shield over his country, and not to wound the heart of his guest. They met: the exiled chieftain of a fallen people, but still cheered on by the sympathy of a nation which had fought like battles with success; and a leader of that nation, who had long labored in building up its greatness, and who was now sinking under the weight of his years and of his toils. A youthful patriot, still meditating battles, stood before a patriarch who had gone through all his battles.

Kossuth visited the city of Washington as the guest of the nation. He was received by Mr. Clay in his sick chamber in company with a few distinguished individuals. The address which Mr. Clay made to him on that occasion, is as follows:

"I owe you, sir, an apology for not having acceded before to the desire you were kind enough to intimate more than once to see me; but really, my health has been so feeble that I did not dare to hazard the excitement of so interesting an interview. Besides, sir (he added, with some pleasantry), your wonderful and fascinating eloquence has mesmerized so large a portion of

our people wherever you have gone, and even some of our members of Congress (waving his hand toward the two or three gentlemen who were present), that I feared to come under its influence, lest you might shake my faith in some principles in regard to the foreign policy of this government, which I have long and constantly cherished.

"And in regard to this matter you will allow me, I hope, to speak with that sincerity and candor which becomes the interest the subject has for you and for myself, and which is due to us both, as the votaries of freedom.

"I trust you will believe me, too, when I tell you that I entertain the liveliest sympathies in every struggle for liberty in Hungary, and in every country, and in this I believe I express the universal sentiment of my countrymen. But, sir, for the sake of my country, you must allow me to protest against the policy you propose to her. Waiving the grave and momentous question of the right of one nation to assume the executive power among nations for the enforcement of international law, or of the right of the United States to dictate to Russia the character of her relations with the nations around her, let us come at once to the practical consideration of the matter.

"You tell us yourself, with great truth and propriety, that mere sympathy, or the expression of sympathy, can not advance your purposes. You require 'material aid.' And indeed it is manifest that the mere declarations of sympathy of Congress, or of the President, or of the public, would be of little avail, unless we were prepared to enforce those declarations by a resort to arms, and unless other nations could see that preparation and determination upon our part.

"Well, sir, suppose that war should be the issue of the course you propose to us. Could we then effect any thing for you, ourselves, or the cause of liberty? To transport men and arms across the ocean in sufficient numbers and quantities to be effective against Russia and Austria would be impossible. It is a fact which perhaps may not be generally known, that the most imperative reason with Great Britain for the close of her last war with us, was the immense cost of the transportation and maintenance of forces and munitions of war in such a distant theater, and yet she had not perhaps more than 30,000 men upon this continent at any time. Upon land, Russia is invulnerable to us, as we are to her. Upon the ocean, a war between Russia and this country would result in mutual annoyance to commerce, but probably in little else. I learn recently that her war marine is superior to that of any nation in Europe, except perhaps Great Britain. Her ports are few, her commerce limited, while we, on our part, would offer as a prey to her cruisers a rich and extensive commerce.

"Thus, sir, after effecting nothing in such a war, after aban-

doning our ancient policy of amity and non-intervention in the affairs of other nations, and thus justifying them in abandoning the terms of forbearance and non-interference which they have hitherto preserved toward us; after the downfall, perhaps, of the friends of liberal institutions in Europe, her despots, imitating, and provoked by our fatal example, may turn upon us in the hour of our weakness and exhaustion, and, with an almost equally irresistible force of reason and of arms, they may say to us, 'You have set us the example. You have quit your own to stand on foreign ground; you have abandoned the policy you professed in the day of your weakness, to interfere in the affairs of the people upon this continent, in behalf of those principles, the supremacy of which you say is necessary to your prosperity, to your existence. We, in our turn, believing that your anarchical doctrines are destructive of, and that monarchical principles are essential to the peace, security and happiness of our subjects, will obliterate the bed which has nourished such noxious weeds; we will crush you as the propagandist of doctrines so destructive of the peace and good order of the world.'

"The indomitable spirit of our people might and would be equal to the emergency, and we might remain unsubdued even by so tremendous a combination; but the consequences to us would be terrible enough. You must allow me, sir, to speak thus freely, as I feel deeply, though my opinion may be of but little import, as the expression of a dying man. Sir, the recent melancholy subversion of the republican government of France, and that enlightened nation voluntarily placing its neck under the yoke of despotism, teach us to despair of any present success for liberal institutions in Europe. They give us an impressive warning not to rely upon others for the vindication of our principles, but to look to ourselves, and to cherish with more care than ever the security of our institutions and the preservation of our policy and principles.

"By the policy to which we have adhered since the days of Washington, we have prospered beyond precedent—we have done more for the cause of liberty in the world than arms could effect. We have showed to other nations the way to greatness and happiness; and, if we but continue united as one people, and persevere in the policy which our experience has so clearly and triumphantly vindicated, we may in another quarter of a century furnish an example which the reason of the world can not resist. But if we should involve ourselves in the tangled web of European politics, in a war in which we could effect nothing, and if in that struggle Hungary should go down, and we should go down with her, where, then, would be the last hope of the friends of freedom throughout the world? Far better is it for ourselves, for Hungary, and for the cause of liberty, that, adhering to our wise, pacific system, and avoiding the distant wars of

Europe, we should keep our lamp burning brightly on this western shore as a light to all nations, than to hazard its utter extinction amid the ruins of fallen or falling republics in Europe."

This was the last public counsel that dropped from Mr. Clay's lips. From his pen, about this time, appeared a letter which he had addressed to a private individual, expressing his preference of Mr. Fillmore as a candidate for the Presidency, though not in derogation of the claims and merits of the other Whig candidates, among whom Mr. Webster and General Scott were most conspicuous. Kossuth was undoubtedly disappointed in his reception by Mr. Clay; for it was not a very strong pledge of "material aid." It was time that some chastening should be administered to the rather extravagant pretensions of this expatriated Hungarian, who had so recently set foot on our shores, and who put himself forward as the interpreter of our history, against our own understanding of it. There was a true sympathy, in the hearts of the American people, with his political misfortunes, and with those of his country. But he presumed too much, and there was of necessity a reaction in the public mind. The enthusiasm of his first reception was of an intoxicating character, but he left the country without being noticed

CHAPTER XIII.

Mr. Clay's Decline.—Extracts from his own Letters and from those of his Son on the subject.—His Death.—Eulogies of Senators.

A FEW extracts from some of Mr. Clay's last letters are perhaps pertinent in this place.

To his son Thomas he wrote, January 10, 1852: "You observe how I am obliged to employ the pen of a friend. I am very thankful for the kind offer of yourself and Mary to come here and nurse me. I should promptly have accepted if it had been necessary, but it was not. Every want and wish that I have, are kindly attended to. I am surrounded by good friends who are ready and willing to serve me; and you and Mary yourselves could not have been more assiduous in your attentions, than are my friends, the Calverts. * * * The solution of the problem of my recovery depends upon the distressing cough which I have. I think it is a little diminished."

To Samuel Allibone, Esq., Philadelphia, he writes by an amanuensis, January 11th, to thank him for his kind offer to come on and assist in nursing him, but he assured Mr. Allibone that he had every needed attention. He adds: "Present my warm regards to your sister, and tell her that, as the probability is, that neither of us is long for this world, I hope that when we go hence, we shall meet in one far better."*

February 12th, Mr. Clay, in a letter to his daughter-in-law, Mrs. James B. Clay, says: "As the world recedes from me, I

* In the Private Correspondence of Mr. Clay will be found a letter from Miss Allibone (Susan), page 577, to Mr. Clay, and one from Mr. Clay to her, page 569. Mr. Clay very highly appreciated the Christian character of Miss Allibone, who had been for many years a bed-ridden invalid, but whose mind was lucid, and her conversation interesting. Her letter to Mr. Clay will indicate her character. She has since died, and her biography has been published, which is full of interest to those who admire eminent piety. Mr. Clay, who had listened to her conversation, was accustomed to speak of her with great respect, as a remarkable Christian lady.

feel my affections more than ever concentrated on my children and theirs. My health has improved a little, but the cough still hangs on, and unless I can get rid of it, or greatly diminish it, I can not expect a radical cure."

To his son, James B. Clay, he writes, February 24th: "There is nothing now that interests me so much as to receive full accounts from the members of my family frequently. * * * My health continues very delicate. My cough hangs on. If I can not get rid of it, I think it must prove fatal. I should be glad to get home once more."

March 14th, he writes to his son James again: "Although I take an opiate every night, and lie in bed fourteen hours, I can get no sound, refreshing sleep. A man whose flesh, strength, appetite, and sleep have been greatly reduced, must be in a bad way; and that is my condition. I have taken immense quantities of drugs, but with little, if any effect on my cough, the disease that threatens me. I may linger on some months, but if there be no speedy improvement, I must finally sink under it. Give my love to dear Susan, and to all your children."

Again, March 22d, to his son James: "My health continues without any material change. I am very weak, write with no comfort, sleep badly, and have very little appetite for food."

To his daughter-in-law, Mrs. Thomas H. Clay, he wrote on the 7th of April: "I have but little sleep, appetite, or strength. If I am spared, and have strength to make the journey, I think of going home in May, or early in June, and in that case I wish to send for Thomas to accompany me."

Having heard of the death of Mr. Jacobs, of Louisville, the father of his son James's wife, he wrote to James on the 10th of April: "I offer to you and to Susan assurances of my cordial condolence. Tell her that I hope she will bear the event with the fortitude of a Christian. * * * If my health thus continues to fail me, I think I can not last a great while. I feel perfectly composed and resigned to my fate, whatever it may be."

The above brief extracts from a correspondence with members of his family, for this period of three months, will be interesting, as a sketch of his own feelings during this time, and of his anticipations of the future, The letters from which they are taken will be found in the Private Correspondence, near the end. They were, of course, chiefly dictated to an amanuensis, as was all his correspondence in his gradually declining state of

health. That correspondence was considerable, as long as he was able to dictate a letter, in answer to the many communications that poured in upon him, as well from discreet as from indiscreet correspondents; for all can not appreciate the importance of not invading the privacy of a sick chamber. Mr. Clay was one of those persons who would always answer a friendly letter if he could; and he was ill at ease when circumstances prevented.

For two weeks from the 10th of April, the date of the last extract above given, Mr. Clay continued to sink, and a telegraphic message was dispatched for his son Thomas, on the 27th, who arrived at his father's bedside on the 5th of May, and remained with him till his death. During this period, Mr. Thomas H. Clay made daily reports to Ashland of his father's health, of which the following are extracts.

On the 8th of May, he writes: "For forty-eight hours after my arrival my father appeared better than he had been for a week previous. He is very feeble, and there is no longer any hope of his reaching Kentucky alive. * * * He has now to be carried from his bed to his couch. He can not talk five minutes in the course of the day without great exhaustion. * * * The Sacrament was administered to him yestetday by Mr. Butler, Chaplain of the Senate."

May 13: "The only thing the doctors can do is to alleviate, as much as they can, the pain arising from his cough and his excessive debility."

May 18: "My father has passed the last twenty-four hours much more comfortably than he had been for a week before. * * * It is the cough, and that alone, that has prostrated him."

May 20: "My father coughed but little last night. Yesterday he was a good deal harassed [by friendly calls, as we suppose]. * * * He insists on my writing to some of the family every day."

May 26: "My father passed a tolerable night."

June 1: "My father listens attentively to every letter from home—had some appetite for dinner yesterday."

June 4: "My father coughed a great deal yesterday, with little intermission. * * * He has suffered a good deal since this time last night." [This letter was written after midnight.]

June 7: "My father was yesterday much depressed." [It was a moral cause, as the letter shows.]

June 9: "My father has become feeble within a few days, and I do not think it possible for him to hold out long."

June 16: "My father has been to-day decidedly worse than he has been since my arrival. * * * He told me this morning that he did not think he should last more than ten days." [He lived thirteen.]

June 20: "My father did not pass a good night. * * * He was too feeble this morning to carry a glass of water to his lips."

June 25: "I now look for a termination in my father's case before many hours. Judge Underwood coincides with me in opinion."

June 29: "I never before imagined that any one could live in the extreme state of debility under which my father is now suffering."

This day, the 29th of June, 1852, at seventeen minutes past eleven o'clock, A. M., Mr. Clay breathed his last.

The Senate met at twelve o'clock. Before the reading of the journal, Mr. Hunter rose, and said: "Mr. President, a rumor has been circulated that Henry Clay is dead. His colleague [Mr. Underwood] is absent, rendering the last sad offices. I therefore move that the Senate adjourn."

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate adjourned.

In the House, after the journal had been read, Mr. Venable, of North Carolina, said:

"Mr. Speaker—In consequence of the report, which may be true, that Henry Clay, the illustrious senator of Kentucky, breathed his last at his lodgings a few moments since, I move that the House adjourn."

And the House of Representatives accordingly adjourned.

It is no ordinary event which we have just recorded. A great man has fallen—a man who filled a large space in the history of his times, and in the affections of the American people—of mankind; for the world saw and admired him. He came to Washington last for what he regarded as the need of his country, as the cloud of anxiety was not yet entirely dispersed. He wished to see it vanish forever from the horizon, and he came to breathe on it again, if, happily, he might see it disappear. He went up, FOR ONCE, to that magnificent Capitol, so long the theater of his patriotic counsels and peerless eloquence. He took

his seat there, as if his country, as if God had need of his service. His country certainly had; but God had decreed otherwise—we hope not in chastisement for the sins of the nation. Mr. Clay never went up to the Capitol again till the solemn pageantry of his funeral obsequies carried him there. Death had marked him as a victim. It was a rare mark—a proud achievement of the Great Destroyer's sway. We have witnessed the sure aim—the terrible havoc of the fatal shaft. Professional skill, the love of kindred, of friends innumerable, of a country not ungrateful, of mankind—for he was the world's benefactor, and known as such—could avail nothing. Death had laid his hand upon him.

The next day after the death of Mr. Clay, a great crowd, sympathizing in this afflictive bereavement of the American people, wended their way to the Senate chamber, in expectation of hearing what might fall from the lips of the colleagues of the departed statesman, in response to this mournful event of Providence. The session was opened, as usual, with prayer by the Rev. Chaplain, whose touching allusions to the occasion on which they were assembled awakened corresponding emotions in the hearts of the crowded audience. Foreign embassadors, heads of the Executive Departments, Judges of the Supreme Court, members of the House of Representatives, and numerous distinguished individuals, strangers and others, were present. After the reading of the journal, Mr. Underwood (Joseph R.), the colleague of Mr. Clay, rose and said:

"Mr. President, I rise to announce the death of my colleague, Mr. Clay. He died at his lodgings, in the National Hotel of this city, at seventeen minutes past eleven o'clock yesterday morning, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. He expired with perfect composure, and without a groan or a struggle.

"By his death, our country has lost one of its most eminent citizens and statesmen; and, I think, its greatest genius. I shall not detain the Senate by narrating the transactions of his long and useful life. His distinguished services as a statesman are inseparably connected with the history of his country. As representative and Speaker in the other House of Congress, as senator in this body, as Secretary of State, and as envoy abroad, he has, in all these positions, exhibited a wisdom and patriotism which have made a deep and lasting impression upon the grateful hearts of his countrymen. His thoughts and his actions have already been published to the world in written biography; in Congressional debates and reports; in the journals of the two

Houses; and in the pages of American history. They have been commemorated by monuments erected on the wayside. They have been engraven on medals of gold. Their memory will survive the monuments of marble and the medals of gold; for these are effaced and decay by the friction of ages. But the thoughts and actions of my late colleague have become identified with the immortality of the human mind, and will pass down from generation to generation as a portion of our national inheritance incapable of annihilation, so long as genius has an admirer, or liberty a friend.

"Mr. President, the character of Henry Clay was formed and developed by the influence of our free institutions. His physical, mental, and moral faculties were the gift of God That they were greatly superior to the faculties allotted to most men, can not be questioned. They were not cultivated, improved, and directed by a liberal or collegiate education. His respectable parents were not wealthy, and had not the means of maintaining their children at college. Moreover, his father died when he was a boy. At an early period Mr. Clay was thrown upon his own resources without patrimony. He grew up in a clerk's office in Richmond, Virginia. He there studied law. He emigrated from his native State and settled in Lexington, Kentucky, where he commenced the practice of his profession before he was of full age.

"The road to wealth, to honor, and fame, was open before him. Under our constitution and laws he might freely employ his great faculties unobstructed by legal impediments, and unaided by exclusive privileges. Very soon, Mr. Clay made a deep and favorable impression upon the people among whom he began his career. The excellence of his natural faculties was soon displayed. Necessity stimulated him in their cultivation. His assiduity, skill, and fidelity, in professional engagements, secured public confidence. He was elected member of the Legislature of Kentucky, in which body he served several sessions prior to 1806. In that year he was elevated to a seat in the Senate of the United States.

"At the bar, and in the General Assembly of Kentucky, Mr. Clay first manifested those high qualities as a public speaker which have secured to him so much popular applause and admiration. His physical and mental organization eminently qualified him to become a great and impressive orator. His person was tall, slender, and commanding. His temperament ardent, fearless, and full of hope. His countenance clear, expressive, and variable—indicating the emotion which predominated at the moment with exact similitude. His voice, cultivated and modulated in harmony with the sentiment he desired to express, fell upon the ear like the melody of enrapturing music. His eye beaming with intelligence and flashing

with coruscations of genius. His gestures and attitudes graceful and natural. These personal advantages won the prepossessions of an audience, even before his intellectual powers began to move his hearers; and when his strong common sense, his profound reasoning, his clear conceptions of his subject in all its bearings, and his striking and beautiful illustrations, united with such personal qualities, were brought to the discussion of any question, his audience was enraptured, convinced, and led by the orator as if enchanted by the lyre of Orpheus.

"No man was ever blessed by his Creator with faculties of a higher order of excellence than those given to Mr. Clay. In the quickness of his perceptions, and the rapidity with which his conclusions were formed, he had few equals, and no superior. He was eminently endowed with a nice discriminating taste for order, symmetry, and beauty. He detected in a moment every thing out of place or deficient in his room, upon his farm, in his own or the dress of others. He was a skillful judge of the form and qualities of his domestic animals, which he delighted to raise on his farm. I could give you instances of the quickness and minuteness of his keen faculty of observation which never overlooked any thing. A want of neatness and order was offensive to him. He was particular and neat in his handwriting, and his apparel. A slovenly blot or negligence of any sort met his condemnation; while he was so organized that he attended to, and arranged little things to please and gratify his natural love for neatness, order, and beauty, his great intellectual faculties grasped all the subjects of jurisprudence and politics with a facility amounting almost to intuition. As a lawyer, he stood at the head of his profession. As a statesman, his stand at the head of the Republican Whig party for nearly half a century, establishes his title to pre-eminence among his illustrious associates.

"Mr. Clay was deeply versed in all the springs of human action. He had read and studied biography and history. Shortly after I left college, I had occasion to call on him in Frankfort, where he was attending court, and I well remember to have found him with Plutarch's Lives in his hands. No one better than he knew how to avail himself of human motives, and all the circumstances which surrounded a subject, or could present them with more force and skill to accomplish the object of an argument.

"Mr. Clay, throughout his public career, was influenced by the loftiest patriotism. Confident in the truth of his convictions and the purity of his purposes, he was ardent, sometimes impetuous, in the pursuit of objects which he believed essential to the general welfare. Those who stood in his way were thrown aside without fear or ceremony. He never affected a courtier's deference to men or opinions which he thought hostile to the

best interests of his country; and hence he may have wounded the vanity of those who thought themselves of consequence. It is certain, whatever the cause, that at one period of his life Mr. Clay might have been referred to as a proof that there is more truth than fiction in those profound lines of the poet:

"'He who ascends the mountain-top shall find
Its loftiest peaks most wrapt in clouds and snow;
He who surpasses or subdues mankind,
Must look down on the hate of those below;
Though far above the sun of glory glow,
And far beneath the earth and ocean spread,
Round him are icy rocks, and loudly blow
Contending tempests on his naked head,
And thus reward the toils which to those summits led.'

"Calumny and detraction emptied their vials upon him. But how glorious the change! He outlived malice and envy. He lived long enough to prove to the world that his ambition was no more than a holy aspiration to make his country the greatest, most powerful, and best-governed on the earth. If he desired its highest office, it was because the greater power and influence resulting from such elevation would enable him to do more than he otherwise could for the progress and advancement—first of his own countrymen, then of his whole race. His sympathies embraced all. The African slave, the Creole of Spanish America, the children of renovated, classic Greece—all families of men, without respect to color or clime, found in his expanded bosom and comprehensive intellect a friend of their elevation and amelioration. Such ambition as that is God's implantation in the human heart for raising the down-trodden nations of the earth, and fitting them for regenerated existence in politics, in morals, and religion.

"Bold and determined as Mr. Clay was in all his actions, he was, nevertheless, conciliating. He did not obstinately adhere to things impracticable. If he could not accomplish the best, he contented himself with the nighest approach to it. He has been the great compromiser of those political agitations and opposing opinions which have, in the belief of thousands, at different times, endangered the perpetuity of our Federal Government and Union.

"Mr. Clay was no less remarkable for his admirable social qualities than for his intellectual abilities. As a companion, he was the delight of his friends; and no man ever had better or truer. They have loved him from the beginning, and loved him to the last. His hospitable mansion at Ashland was always open to their reception. No guest ever thence departed without feeling happier for his visit. But, alas! that hospitable mansion has already been converted into a house of mourning; already has intelligence of his death passed with electric velocity to that aged and now widowed lady who, for more than fifty years, bore

to him all the endearing relations of wife, and whose feeble condition prevented her from joining him in this city, and soothing the anguish of life's last scene by those endearing attentions which no one can give so well as a woman and a wife. May God infuse into her heart and mind the Christian spirit of submission under her bereavment! It can not be long before she may expect a re-union in Heaven. A nation condoles with her and her children on account of their irreparable loss.

"Mr. Clay, from the nature of his disease, declined very gradually. He bore his protracted sufferings with great equanimity and patience. On one occasion he said to me that when death was inevitable and must soon come, and when the sufferer was ready to die, he did not perceive the wisdom of praying to be 'delivered from sudden death.' He thought under such circumstances the sooner suffering was relieved by death the better. He desired the termination of his own sufferings, while he acknowledged the duty of patiently waiting and abiding the pleasure of God. Mr. Clay frequently spoke to me of his hope of eternal life, founded upon the merits of Jesus Christ as a Saviour; who, as he remarked, came into the world to bring 'life and immortality to light.' He was a member of the Episcopalian Church. In one of our conversations he told me that, as his hour of dissolution approached, he found that his affections were concentrating more and more upon his domestic circle—his wife and children. In my daily visits he was in the habit of asking me to detail to him the transactions of the Senate. This I did, and he manifested much interest in passing occurrences. His inquiries were less frequent as his end approached. For the week preceding his death, he seemed to be altogether abstracted from the concerns of the world. When he became so low that he could not converse without being fatigued, he frequently requested those around him to converse. He would then quietly listen. He retained his mental faculties in great perfection. His memory remained perfect. He frequently mentioned events and conversations of recent occurrence, showing that he had a perfect recollection of what was said and done. He said to me that he was grateful to God for continuing to him the blessing of reason, which enabled him to contemplate and reflect on his situation. He manifested, during his confinement, the same characteristics which marked his conduct through the vigor of his life. He was exceedingly averse to give his friends '*trouble*,' as he called it. Some time before he knew it, we commenced waiting through the night in an adjoining room. He said to me after passing a painful day, 'perhaps some one had better remain all night in the parlor.' From this time he knew some friend was constantly at hand ready to attend to him.

"Mr. President, the majestic form of Mr. Clay will no more

grace these Halls. No more shall we hear that voice which has so often thrilled and charmed the assembled representatives of the American people. No more shall we see that waving hand and eye of light, as when he was engaged in unfolding his policy in regard to the varied interests of our growing and mighty republican empire. His voice is silent on earth forever. The darkness of death has obscured the luster of his eye. But the memory of his services—not only to his beloved Kentucky, not only to the United States, but to the cause of human freedom and progress throughout the world—will live through future ages, as a bright example, stimulating and encouraging his own countrymen and the people of all nations in their patriotic devotion to country and humanity.

"With Christians, there is yet a nobler and a higher thought in regard to Mr. Clay. They will think of him in connection with eternity. They will contemplate his immortal spirit occupying its true relative magnitude among the moral stars of glory in the presence of God. They will think of him as having fulfilled the duties allotted to him on earth, having been regenerated by Divine grace, and having passed through the valley of the shadow of death, and reached an everlasting and happy home in that 'house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'

"On Sunday morning last, I was watching alone at Mr. Clay's bedside. For the last hour he had been unusually quiet, and I thought he was sleeping. In that, however, he told me I was mistaken. Opening his eyes and looking at me, he said, 'Mr. Underwood, there may be some question where my remains shall be buried. Some persons may designate Frankfort. I wish to repose in the cemetery at Lexington, where many of my friends and connections are buried.' My reply was, 'I will endeavor to have your wish executed.'

"I now ask the Senate to have his corpse transmitted to Lexington, Kentucky, for sepulture. Let him sleep with the dead of that city, in and near which his home has been for more than half a century. For the people of Lexington, the living and the dead, he manifested, by the statement made to me, a pure and holy sympathy, and a desire to cleave unto them, as strong as that which bound Ruth to Naomi. It was his anxious wish to return to them before he died, and to realize what the daughter of Moab so strongly felt and beautifully expressed: 'Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. Where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried.'

"It is fit that the tomb of Henry Clay should be in the city of Lexington. In our Revolution, liberty's first libation of blood was poured out in a town of that name in Massachusetts. On hearing it, the pioneers of Kentucky consecrated the name, and applied it to the place where Mr. Clay desired to be buried. The associations connected with the name harmonize with his

character; and the monument erected to his memory at the spot selected by him will be visited by the votaries of genius and liberty with that reverence which is inspired at the tomb of Washington. Upon that monument let his epitaph be engraved.

"Mr. President, I have availed myself of Doctor Johnson's paraphrase of the epitaph on Thomas Hammer, with a few alterations and additions, to express in borrowed verse my admiration for the life and character of Mr. Clay, and with this heart-tribute to the memory of my illustrious colleague, I conclude my remarks:

"'Born when Freedom her stripes and stars unfurled,
When Revolution shook the startled world;
Heroes and sages taught his brilliant mind
To know and love the rights of all mankind.
In life's first bloom his public toils began,
At once commenced the senator and man,
In business dext'rous, weighty in debate,
Near fifty years he labored for the State.
In every speech persuasive wisdom flowed,
In every act refulgent virtue glowed;
Suspended faction ceased from rage and strife,
To hear his eloquence and praise his life.
Resistless merits fixed the members' choice,
Who hailed him Speaker with united voice.
His talents ripening with advancing years;
His wisdom growing with his public cares;
A chosen envoy, War's dark horrors cease,
And tides of carnage turn to streams of peace.
Conflicting principles, internal strife,
Tariff and slavery, disunion rife,
All are *compromised* by his master-hand,
And beams of joy illuminate the land.
Patriot, Christian, Husband, Father, Friend,
Thy work of life achieved a glorious end!'

"I offer the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That a committee of six be appointed by the President of the Senate, to take order for superintending the funeral of Henry Clay, late a member of this body, which will take place to-morrow at 12 o'clock, meridian, and that the Senate will attend the same.

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Senate, from a sincere desire of showing every mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, will go into mourning for one month by the usual mode of wearing crape on the left arm.

"*Resolved*, As a further mark of respect entertained by the Senate for the memory of Henry Clay, and his long and distinguished services to his country, that his remains, in pursuance of the known wishes of his family, be removed to the place of sepulture selected by himself at Lexington, in Kentucky, in charge of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and attended by a committee of six senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall have full power to carry this resolution into effect."

REMARKS OF MR. CASS.*

"Mr. President: Again has an impressive warning come to teach us that in the midst of life we are in death. The ordi-

* General Lewis Cass, of Michigan.

nary labors of this Hall are suspended, and its contentions hushed, before the power of Him who says to the storm of human passions, as He said of old to the waves of Galilee, 'PEACE, BE STILL.' The lessons of His Providence, severe as they may be, often become merciful dispensations, like that which is now spreading sorrow through the land, and which is reminding us that we have higher duties to fulfill, and graver responsibilities to encounter, than those that meet us here, when we lay our hands upon His holy Word, and invoke His holy name, promising to be faithful to that Constitution which He gave us in His mercy, and will withdraw only in the hour of our blindness and disobedience, and of His own wrath.

"Another great man has fallen in our land, ripe, indeed, in years and in honors, but never dearer to the American people than when called from the theater of his services and renown, to that final bar where the lofty and the lowly must all meet at last.

"I do not rise upon this mournful occasion to indulge in the language of panegyric. My regard for the memory of the dead, and for the obligations of the living, would equally rebuke such a course. The severity of truth is at once our proper duty and our best consolation. Born during the revolutionary struggle, our deceased associate was one of the few remaining public men who connect the present generation with the actors in the trying scenes of that eventful period, and whose deeds and names will soon be known only in the history of their country. He was another illustration, and a noble one, too, of the glorious equality of our institutions, which freely offer all their rewards to all who justly seek them, for he was the architect of his own fortune, having made his way in life by self-exertion; and he was an early adventurer in the great forest of the West, then a world of primitive vegetation, but now the abode of intelligence and religion, of prosperity and civilization.

"But he possessed that intellectual superiority which overcomes surrounding obstacles, and which local seclusion can not long withhold from general knowledge and appreciation. It is almost half a century since he passed through Chillicothe, then the seat of government of Ohio, where I was a member of the Legislature, on his way to take his place in this very body which is now listening to this reminiscence, and to a feeble tribute of regard from one who then saw him for the first time, but who can never forget the impression he produced by the charms of his conversation, the frankness of his manner, and the high qualities with which he was endowed. Since then he has belonged to his country, and has taken a part, and a prominent part, both in peace and war, in all the great questions affecting her interests and her honor; and though it has been my fortune often to differ from him, yet I believe he was as pure a patriot as ever participated in the councils of a nation, anxious for the

public good, and seeking to promote it during all the vicissitudes of a long and eventful life. That he exercised a powerful influence within the sphere of his action, through the whole country, indeed we all feel and know; and we know, too, the eminent endowments which gave him this high distinction. Frank and fearless in the expression of his opinions, and in the performance of his duties—with rare powers of eloquence, which never failed to rivet the attention of his auditory, and which always commanded admiration, even when they did not carry conviction—prompt in decision and firm in action, and with a vigorous intellect, trained in the contests of a stirring life, and strengthened by enlarged experience and observation, joined withal to an ardent love of country, and to great purity of purpose; these were the elements of his power and success. And we dwell upon them with mournful gratification, now when we shall soon follow him to the cold and silent tomb, where we shall commit earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, but with the blessed conviction of the truth of that Divine revelation, which teaches us that there is life and hope beyond the narrow house, where we shall leave him alone to the mercy of his God and of ours.

"He has passed beyond the reach of human praise or censure; but the judgment of his cotemporaries has preceded and pronounced the judgment of history, and his name and fame will shed luster upon his country, and will be proudly cherished in the hearts of his countrymen for long ages to come. Yes, they will be cherished and freshly remembered when these marble columns that surround us, so often the witnesses of his triumphs, but in a few brief hours, when his mortal frame, despoiled of the immortal spirit, shall rest under this dome for the last time, to become the witnesses of his defeat in that final contest, where the mightiest fall before the great destroyer—when these marble columns shall themselves have fallen, like all the works of man, leaving their broken fragments to tell the story of former magnificence, amid the very ruins which announce decay and desolation.

"I was often with him during his last illness, when the world and the things of the world were fast fading away before him. He knew that the silver cord was almost loosed, and that the golden bowl was breaking at the fountain; but he was resigned to the will of Providence, feeling that He who gave has the right to take away in His own good time and manner. After his duty to his Creator, and his anxiety for his family, his first care was for his country, and his first wish for the preservation and perpetuation of the Constitution and the Union, dear to him in the hour of death, as they had ever been in the vigor of life. Of that Constitution and Union, whose defense, in the last and greatest crisis of their peril, had called forth all his energies, and had stimulated those memorable and powerful exertions, which

he who witnessed can never forget, and which, no doubt, hastened the final catastrophe, a nation now deplores, with a sincerity and unanimity not less honorable to themselves than to the memory of the object of their affections. And when we shall enter that narrow valley through which he has passed before us, and which leads to the judgment-seat of God, may we be able to say, through faith in His Son, our Saviour, and in the beautiful language of the hymn of the dying Christian—dying, but ever living and triumphant:

"'The world recedes, it disappears!
Heaven opens on my eyes! my ears
With sounds seraphic ring:
Lend, lend your wings! I mount! I fly!
Oh grave where is thy victory?
Oh death where is thy sting?'

"'Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.'"

REMARKS OF MR. HUNTER.*

"Mr. President, we have heard, with deep sensibility, what has just fallen from the senators who have preceded me. We have heard, sir, the voice of Kentucky—and, upon this occasion, she had a right to speak—in mingled accents of pride and sorrow; for it has rarely fallen to the lot of any State to lament the loss of such a son. But Virginia, too, is entitled to her place in this procession; for she can not be supposed to be unmindful of the tie which bound her to the dead. When the earth opens to receive the mortal part which she gave to man, it is then that affection is eager to bury in its bosom every recollection but those of love and kindness. And, sir, when the last sensible tie is about to be severed, it is then that we look with anxious interest to the deeds of the life, and to the emanations of the heart and the mind, for those more enduring monuments which are the creation of an immortal nature.

"In this instance, we can be at no loss for these. This land, sir, is full of the monuments of his genius. His memory is as imperishable as American history itself, for he was one of those who made it. Sir, he belonged to the marked class who are the men of their century; for it was his rare good fortune not only to have been endowed with the capacity to do great things, but to have enjoyed the opportunities of achieving them. I know, sir, it has been said and deplored, that he wanted some of the advantages of an early education; but it, perhaps, has not been remembered that, in many respects, he enjoyed such opportunities for mental training as can rarely fall to the lot of man. He had not a chance to learn as much from books, but he had such opportunities of learning from men as few men have ever en-

* Robert M. T. Hunter, of Virginia.

joyed. Sir, it is to be remembered that he was reared at a time when there was a state of society in the Commonwealth which gave him birth, such as has never been seen there before nor since. It was his early privilege to see how justice was administered by a Pendleton and a Wythe, with the last of whom he was in the daily habit of familiar intercourse. He had constant opportunities to observe how forensic questions were managed by a Marshall and a Wickham. He was old enough, too, to have heard and to have appreciated the eloquence of a Patrick Henry, and of George Keith Taylor. In short, sir, he lived in a society in which the examples of a Jefferson, and a Madison, and a Monroe, were living influences, and on which the setting sun of a Washington cast the mild effulgence of its departing rays.

"He was trained, too, as has been well said by the senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass), at a period when the recent revolutionary struggle had given a more elevated tone to patriotism and imparted a higher cast to public feeling and to public character. Such lessons were worth, perhaps, more to him than the whole encyclopædia of scholastic learning. Not only were the circumstances of his early training favorable to the development of his genius, but the theater upon which he was thrown was eminently propitious for its exercise. The circumstances of the early settlement of Kentucky, the generous, daring, and reckless character of the people—all fitted it to be the theater for the display of those commanding qualities of heart and mind which he so eminently possessed. There can be little doubt but that those people and their chosen leader exercised a mutual influence upon each other; and no one can be surprised that, with his brave spirit, and commanding eloquence, and fascinating address, he should have led not only there but elsewhere.

"I did not know him, Mr. President, as you did, in the freshness of his prime, or in the full maturity of his manhood. I did not hear him, sir, as you have heard him, when his voice roused the spirit of his countrymen for war—when he cheered the drooping, when he rallied the doubting, through all the vicissitudes of a long and doubtful contest. I have never seen him, sir, when, from the height of the chair, he ruled the House of Representatives by the energy of his will, or when upon the level of the floor he exercised a control almost as absolute, by the mastery of his intellect. When I first knew him, his sun had a little passed its zenith. The effacing hand of time had just begun to touch the lineaments of his manhood. But yet, sir, I saw enough of him to be able to realize what he might have been in the prime of his strength, and in the full vigor of his maturity. I saw him, sir, as you did, when he led the 'Opposition' during the administration of Mr. Van Buren. I had daily opportunities of witnessing the exhibition of his powers during the extra session under Mr. Tyler's administration. And

I saw, as we all saw, in a recent contest, the exhibition of power on his part, which was most marvelous in one of his years.

"Mr. President, he may not have had as much analytical skill as some others, in dissecting a subject. It may be, perhaps, that he did not seek to look quite so far ahead as some who have been most distinguished for political forecast. But it may be truly said of Mr. Clay, that he was no exaggerator. He looked at events through neither end of the telescope, but surveyed them with the natural and the naked eye. He had the capacity of seeing things as the people saw them, and of feeling things as the people felt them. He had, sir, beyond any other man whom I have ever seen, the true mesmeric touch of the orator—the rare art of transferring his impulses to others. Thoughts, feelings, emotions, came from the ready mold of his genius, radiant and glowing, and communicated their own warmth to every heart which received them. His, too, was the power of wielding the higher and intenser forms of passion with a majesty and an ease which none but the great masters of the human heart can ever employ. It was his rare good fortune to have been one of those who form, as it were, a sensible link and a living tradition which connects one age with another, and through which one generation speaks its thoughts and feelings, and appeals to another. And unfortunate is it for a country when it ceases to possess such men, for it is to them that we chiefly owe the capacity to maintain the unity of the great Epos of human history, and preserve the consistency of political action.

"Sir, it may be said that the grave is still new-made which covers the mortal remains of one of those great men who have been taken from our midst, and the earth is soon to open to receive another. I know not, sir, whether it can be said to be a matter of lamentation, so far as the dead are concerned, that the thread of this life has been clipped when once it has been fully spun. They escape the infirmities of age, and they leave an imperishable name behind them. The loss, sir, is not theirs, but ours; and a loss the more to be lamented that we see none to fill the places thus made vacant on the stage of public affairs. But it may be well for us, who have much more cause to mourn and to lament such deaths, to pause amid the business of life for the purpose of contemplating the spectacle before us, and of drawing the moral from the passing event. It is when death seizes for its victims those who are, by a 'a head and shoulders, taller than all the rest,' that we feel most deeply the uncertainty of human affairs, and that 'the glories of our mortal state are shadows, not substantial things.' It is, sir, in such instances as the present that we can best study by the light of example the true object of life, and the wisest ends of human pursuit."

REMARKS OF MR. HALE.*

"Mr. President: I hope I shall not be considered obtrusive, if, on this occasion, for a brief moment, I mingle my humble voice with those that, with an ability that I shall neither attempt nor hope to equal, have sought to do justice to the worth and memory of the deceased, and, at the same time, appropriately to minister to the sympathies and sorrows of a stricken people. Sir, it is the teaching of inspiration that 'no man liveth and no man *dieth* unto himself.'

"There is a lesson taught no less in the death than in the life of every man—eminently so in the case of one who has filled a large space and occupied a distinguished position in the thoughts and regard of his fellow-men. Particularly instructive at this time is the event which we now deplore, although the circumstances attending his decease are such as are calculated to assuage rather than aggravate the grief which it must necessarily cause. His time had fully come. The threescore and ten, marking the ordinary period of human life, had for some years been passed, and, full of years and of honors, he has gone to his rest. And now, when the nation is marshaling itself for the contest which is to decide 'who shall be greatest,' as if to chasten our ambition, to restrain and subdue the violence of passion, to moderate our desires and elevate our hopes, we have the spectacle of one who, by the force of his intellect, and the energy of his own purpose, had achieved a reputation which the highest official honors of the Republic might have illustrated, but could not have enhanced, laid low in death—as if, at the very outset of this political contest, on which the nation is now entering, to teach the ambitious and aspiring the end of human pursuits and earthly honor. But, sir, I do not intend to dwell on that moral which is taught by the silent lips and closed eye of the illustrious dead, with a force such as no man ever spoke with; but I shall leave the event, with its silent and mute eloquence, to impress its own appropriate teachings on the heart.

"In the long and eventful life of Mr. Clay, in the various positions which he occupied, in the many posts of public duty which he filled, in the many exhibitions which his history affords of untiring energy, of unsurpassed eloquence, and of devoted patriotism, it would be strange, indeed, if different minds, as they dwell upon the subject, were all to select the same incidents of his life as pre-eminently calculated to challenge admiration and respect.

"Sir, my admiration, ay, my affection for Mr. Clay was won and secured many years since, even in my school-boy days—when his voice of counsel, encouragement, and sympathy, was heard in the other Hall of this Capitol, in behalf of the struggling

* John P. Hale, of New Hampshire.

colonies of the southern portion of this continent, who, in pursuit of their inalienable rights, in imitation of our own forefathers, had unfurled the banner of liberty, and, regardless of consequences, had gallantly rushed into that contest where 'life is lost, or freedom won.' And again, sir, when Greece, rich in the memories of the past, awoke from the slumber of ages of oppression and centuries of shame, and resolved

"'To call her virtues back, and conquer time and fate'—

there, over the plains of that classic land, above the din of battle and the clash of arms, mingling with the shouts of the victors and the groans of the vanquished, were heard the thrilling and stirring notes of that same eloquence, excited by a sympathy which knew no bounds, wide as the world, pleading the cause of Grecian liberty before the American Congress, as if to pay back to Greece the debt which every patriot and orator felt was her due. Sir, in the long and honorable career of the deceased, there are many events and circumstances upon which his friends and posterity will dwell with satisfaction and pride, but none which will preserve his memory with more unfading luster to future ages than the course he pursued in the Spanish-American and Greek revolutions."

REMARKS OF MR. CLEMENS.*

"Mr. President: I should not have thought it necessary to add any thing to what has already been said, but for a request preferred by some of the friends of the deceased. I should have been content to mourn him in silence, and leave it to other tongues to pronounce his eulogy. What I have now to say shall be brief—very brief.

"Mr. President, it is now less than three short years ago since I first entered this body. At that period it numbered among its members many of the most illustrious statesmen this Republic has ever produced, or the world has ever known. Of the living it is not my purpose to speak; but in that brief period death has been busy here; and, as if to mark the feebleness of human things, his arrows have been aimed at the highest, the mightiest of us all. First died Calhoun. And well, sir, do I remember the deep feeling evinced on that occasion by him whose death has been announced here to-day, when he said: 'I was his senior in years—in nothing else. In the course of nature I ought to have preceded him. It has been decreed otherwise: but I know that I shall linger here only a short time, and shall soon follow him.' It was genius mourning over his younger brother, and too surely predicting his own approaching end.

"He, too, sir, is now gone from among us, and left none like

* Jeremiah Clemens, of Alabama.

him behind. That voice, whose every tone was music, is hushed and still. That clear, bright eye, is dim and lusterless; and that breast, where grew and flourished every quality which could adorn and dignify our nature, is cold as the clod that soon must cover it. A few hours have wrought a mighty change—a change for which a lingering illness had, indeed, in some degree, prepared us, but which, nevertheless, will still fall upon the nation with crushing force. Many a sorrowing heart is now asking, as I did yesterday, when I heard the first sound of the funeral bell—

> "'And is he gone?—the pure of the purest,
> The hand that upheld our bright banner the surest,
> Is he gone from our struggles away?
> But yesterday lending a people new life,
> Cold, mute, in the coffin to-day.'

"Mr. President, this is an occasion when eulogy must fail to perform its office. The long life which is now ended is a history of glorious deeds too mighty for the tongue of praise. It is in the hearts of his countrymen that his best epitaph must be written. It is in the admiration of a world that his renown must be recorded. In that deep love of country which distinguished every period of his life, he may not have been unrivaled. In loftiness of intellect he was not without his peers. The skill with which he touched every chord of the human heart may have been equaled. The iron will, the unbending firmness, the fearless courage, which marked his character, may have been shared by others. But where shall we go to find all those qualities united, concentrated, blended into one brilliant whole, and shedding a luster upon one single head, which does not dazzle the beholder only because it attracts his love and demands his worship?

"I scarcely know, sir, how far it may be allowable, upon an occasion like this, to refer to party struggles which have left wounds not yet entirely healed. I will venture, however, to suggest, that it should be a source of consolation to his friends that he lived long enough to see the full accomplishment of the last great work of his life, and to witness the total disappearance of that sectional tempest which threatened to overwhelm the Republic in ruins. Both the great parties of the country have agreed to stand upon the platform which he erected, and both of them have solemnly pledged themselves to maintain unimpaired the work of his hands. I doubt not the knowledge of this cheered him in his dying moments, and helped to steal away the pangs of dissolution.

"Mr. President, if I knew any thing more that I could say, I would gladly utter it. To me he was something more than kind, and I am called upon to mingle a private with a public grief. I wish that I could do something to add to his fame.

But he built for himself a monument of immortality, and left to his friends no task but that of soothing their own sorrow for his loss. We pay to him the tribute of our tears. More we have no power to bestow. Patriotism, honor, genius, courage, have all come to strew their garlands about his tomb; and well they may, for he was the peer of them all."

REMARKS OF MR. COOPER.*

"Mr. President, it is not always by words that the living pay to the dead the sincerest and most eloquent tribute. The tears of a nation, flowing spontaneously over the grave of a public benefactor, is a more eloquent testimonial of his worth and of the affection and veneration of his countrymen, than the most highly-wrought eulogium of the most gifted tongue. The heart is not necessarily the fountain of words, but it is always the source of tears, whether they be of joy, gratitude, or grief. But sincere, truthful, and eloquent, as they are, they leave no permanent record of the virtues and greatness of him on whose tomb they are shed. As the dews of heaven falling at night are absorbed by the earth, or dried up by the morning sun, so the tears of a people, shed for their benefactor, disappear without leaving a trace to tell the future generations of the services, sacrifices, and virtues, of him to whose memory they were a grateful tribute. But as homage paid to virtue is an incentive to it, it is right that the memory of the good, the great, and the noble of the earth should be preserved and honored.

"The ambition, Mr. President, of the truly great is more the hope of living in the memory and estimation of future ages than of possessing power in their own. It is this hope that stimulates them to perseverance; that enables them to encounter disappointment, ingratitude, and neglect, and to press on through toils, privations, and perils to the end. It was not the hope of discovering a world, over which he should himself exercise dominion, that sustained Columbus in all his trials. It was not for this he braved danger, disappointment, poverty, and reproach. It was not for this he subdued his native pride, wandered from kingdom to kingdom, kneeling at the feet of princes a suppliant for means to prosecute his sublime enterprise. It was not for this, after having at last secured the patronage of Isabella, that he put off in his crazy and ill-appointed fleet into unknown seas, to struggle with storms and tempests, and the rage of a mutinous crew. It was another and a nobler kind of ambition that stimulated him to contend with terror, superstition, and despair, and to press forward on his perilous course, when the needle in his compass, losing its polarity seemed to unite with the fury of the elements and the insubordination of his crew in turning him

* James Cooper, of Pennsylvania.

back from his perilous but glorious enterprise. It was the hope which was realized at last, when his ungrateful country was compelled to inscribe, as an epitaph on his tomb,

"'Columbus has given a new world to the kingdoms of Castile and Leon,'

that enabled him at first to brave so many disappointments, and at last to conquer the multitude of perils that beset his pathway on the deep. This, sir, is the ambition of the truly great—not to achieve present fame, but future immortality. This being the case, it is befitting here to-day to add to the life of Henry Clay, the record of his death, signalized as it is by a nation's gratitude and grief. It is right that posterity should learn from us, the cotemporaries of the illustrious deceased, that his virtues and services were appreciated by his country, and acknowledged by the tears of his countrymen poured out upon his grave.

"The career of Henry Clay was a wonderful one. And what an illustration of the excellence of our institutions would a retrospect of his life afford! Born in an humble station, without any of the adventitious aids of fortune by which the obstructions on the road to fame are smoothed, he rose not only to the most exalted eminence of position, but likewise to the highest place in the affections of his countrymen. Taking into view the disadvantages of his early position, disadvantages against which he had always to contend, his career is without a parallel in the history of great men. To have seen him a youth, without friends or fortune, and with but a scanty education, who would have ventured to predict for him a course so brilliant and beneficent, and a fame so well deserved and enduring? Like a pine, however, which sometimes springs up amid the rocks on the mountain side, with scarce a crevice in which to fix its roots or soil to nourish them, but which, nevertheless, overtops all the trees of the surrounding forest, Henry Clay, by his own inherent, self-sustaining energy and genius, rose to an altitude of fame almost unequaled in the age in which he lived. As an orator, legislator, and statesman, he had no superior. All his faculties were remarkable, and in remarkable combination. Possessed of a brilliant genius and fertile imagination, his judgment was sound, discriminating, and eminently practical. Of an ardent and impetuous temperament, he was nevertheless persevering and firm of purpose. Frank, bold, and intrepid, he was cautious in providing against the contingencies and obstacles which might possibly rise up in the road to success. Generous, liberal, and entertaining broad and expanded views of national policy, in his legislative course he never transcended the limits of a wise economy.

"But, Mr. President, of all his faculties, that of making friends and attaching them to him was the most remarkable and extra-

ordinary. In this respect, he seemed to possess a sort of fascination, by which all who came into his presence were attracted toward and bound to him by ties which neither time nor circumstances had power to dissolve or weaken. In the admiration of his friends was the recognition of the divinity of intellect; in their attachment to him a confession of his generous personal qualities and social virtues.

"Of the public services of Mr. Clay, the present occasion affords no room for a sketch more extended than that which his respected colleague [Mr. Underwood] has presented. It is, however, sufficient to say, that for more than forty years he has been a prominent actor in the drama of American affairs. During the late war with England his voice was more potent than any other in awakening the spirit of the country, infusing confidence into the people, and rendering available their resources for carrying on the contest. In our domestic controversies, threatening the peace of the country and the integrity of the Union, he has always been first to note danger as well as to suggest the means of averting it. When the waters of the great political deep were upheaved by the tempest of discord, and the ark of the Union, freighted with the hopes and destinies of freedom, tossing about on the raging billows, and drifting every moment nearer to the vortex which threatened to swallow it up, it was his clarion voice, rising above the storm, that admonished the crew of impending peril, and counseled the way to safety.

"But, Mr. President, devotedly as he loved his country, his aspirations were not limited to its welfare alone. Wherever freedom had a votary, that votary had a friend in Henry Clay; and in the struggle of the Spanish colonies for independence, he uttered words of encouragement which have become the mottoes on the banners of freedom in every land. But neither the services which he has rendered his own country, nor his wishes for the welfare of others, nor his genius, nor the affection of friends, could turn aside the destroyer. No price could purchase exemption from the common lot of humanity. Henry Clay, the wise, the great, the gifted, had to die; and his history is summed up in the biography which the Russian poet has prepared for all, kings and serfs, viz.:

"'Born, living, dying,
Quitting the still shore for the troubled wave,
Struggling with storm-clouds, over shipwrecks flying,
And casting anchor in the silent grave.'

"But though time would not spare him, there is still this consolation: He died peacefully and happy, ripe in renown, full of years and of honors, and rich in the affections of his country. He enjoyed, too, the unspeakable satisfaction of closing his eyes

while the country he had loved so much and served so well was still in the enjoyment of peace, happiness, union, and prosperity —still advancing in all the elements of wealth, greatness, and power.

"I know, Mr. President, how unequal I have been to the apparently self-imposed task of presenting, in an appropriate manner, the merits of the illustrious deceased. But if I had remained silent on an occasion like this, when the hearts of my constituents are swelling with grief, I would have been disowned by them. It is for this reason—that of giving utterance to their feelings ss well as my own—that I have trespassed on the time of the Senate. I would that I could have spoken fitter words; but, such as they are, they have been uttered by the tongue in response to the promptings of the heart."

REMARKS OF MR. SEWARD.*

"Mr. President: Fifty years ago, Henry Clay, of Virginia, already adopted by Kentucky, then as youthful as himself, entered the service of his country, a representative in the unpretending Legislature of that rising State; and having thenceforward pursued, with ardor and constancy, the gradual paths of an aspiring change through Halls of Congress, foreign courts, and Executive councils, he has now, with the cheerfulness of a patriot, and the serenity of a Christian, fitly closed his long and arduous career, here in the Senate, in the full presence of the Republic, looking down upon the scene with anxiety and alarm —not merely a senator like one of us who yet remain in the Senate-house, but filling that character which, though it had no authority of law, and was assigned without suffrage, Augustus Cæsar nevertheless declared was above the title of Emperor, *Primus inter Illustres*—the Prince of the Senate.

"Generals are tried, Mr. President, by examining the campaigns they have lost or won, and statesmen by reviewing the transactions in which they have been engaged. Hamilton would have been unknown to us had there been no Constitution to be created, as Brutus would have died in obscurity, had there been no Cæsar to be slain.

"Colonization, Revolution, and Organization—three great acts in the drama of our national progress—had already passed when the Western patriot appeared on the public stage. He entered in that next division of the majestic scenes which was marked by an inevitable re-action of political forces, a wild strife of factions, and ruinous embarrassments in our foreign relations. This transition-stage is always more perilous than any other in the career of nations, and especially in the career of Republics. It proved fatal to the Commonwealth of England. Scarcely any

* William H. Seward, of New York.

of the Spanish-American States have yet emerged from it; and it has more than once been sadly signalized by the ruin of the Republican cause in France.

"The continuous administration of Washington and John Adams, had closed under a cloud which had thrown a broad, dark shadow over the future; the nation was deeply indebted at home and abroad, and its credit was prostrate. The revolutionary factions had given place to two inveterate parties, divided by a gulf which had been worn by the conflict in which the Constitution was adopted, and made broader and deeper by a war of prejudices concerning the merits of the belligerents in the great European struggle that then convulsed the civilized world. Our extraordinary political system was little more than an ingenious theory, not yet practically established. The Union of the States was as yet only one of compact; for the political, social, and commercial necessities to which it was so marvelously adapted, and which, clustering thickly upon it, now render it indissoluble, had not then been broadly disclosed, nor had the habits of acquiescence, and the sentiments of loyalty, always of slow growth, fully ripened. The bark that had gone to sea, thus unfurnished and untried, seemed quite certain to founder by reason of its own inherent frailty, even if it should escape unharmed in the great conflict of nations, which acknowledged no claims of justice, and tolerated no pretensions to neutrality. Moreover, the territory possessed by the nation was inadequate to commercial exigences, and indispensable social expansion; and yet no provision had been made for enlargement, nor for extending the political system over distant regions, inhabited or otherwise, which must inevitably be acquired. Nor could any such acquisition be made without disturbing the carefully adjusted balance of powers among the members of the Confederacy.

"These difficulties, Mr. President, although they grew less with time and by slow degrees, continued throughout the whole life of the statesman whose obsequies we are celebrating. Be it known, then—and I am sure that history will confirm the instruction—that conservatism was the interest of the nation, and the responsibility of its rulers, during the period in which he flourished. He was ardent, bold, generous, and even ambitious; and yet, with a profound conviction of the true exigences of the country, like Alexander Hamilton, he disciplined himself, and trained a restless nation, that knew only self-control, to the rigorous practice of that often humiliating conservatism which its welfare and security in that particular crisis so imperiously demanded.

"It could not have happened, sir, to any citizen to have acted alone, nor even to have acted always the most conspicuous part, in a trying period so long protracted. Henry Clay, therefore,

shared the responsibilities of Government with not only his proper cotemporaries, but also survivors of the Revolution, as well as also many who will now succeed himself. Delicacy forbids my naming those who retain their places here; but we may, without impropriety, recall among his compeers a senator of vast resources and inflexible resolve, who has recently withdrawn from this Chamber, but I trust not altogether from public life, (Mr. Benton); and another, who, surpassing all his cotemporaries within his country, and even throughout the world, in the proper eloquence of the forum, now, in autumnal years, for a second time, dignifies and adorns the highest seat in the Executive Council, (Mr. Webster). Passing by those eminent and noble men, the shades of Calhoun, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Monroe, Madison, and Jefferson, rise up before us—statesmen whose living and local fame has ripened already into historical and world-wide renown.

"Among geniuses so lofty as these, Henry Clay bore a part in regulating the constitutional freedom of political debate; establishing that long-contested and most important line which divides the sovereignty of the several States from that of the States confederated; asserting the right of neutrality, and vindicating it by a war against Great Britain, when that just, but extreme measure became necessary; adjusting the terms on which that perilous, yet honorable contest, was brought to a peaceful close; perfecting the army, and the navy, and national fortifications; settling the fiscal and financial policy of the Government in more than one crisis of apparently-threatened revolution; asserting and calling into exercise the powers of the Government for making and improving internal communications between the States; arousing and encouraging the Spanish-American colonies on this continent to throw off the foreign yoke, and to organize governments on principles congenial to our own, and thus creating external bulwarks for our own national defense; establishing equal and impartial peace and amity with all existing maritime powers; and extending the constitutional organization of Government over vast regions, all secured in his lifetime by purchase or by conquest, whereby the pillars of the Republic have been removed from the banks of the St. Mary's to the borders of the Rio Grande, and from the margin of the Mississippi to the Pacific coast. We may not yet discuss the wisdom of the several measures which have thus passed in review before us, nor of the positions which the deceased statesman assumed in regard to them, but we may, without offense, dwell upon the comprehensive results of them all.

"The Union exists in absolute integrity, and the Republic in complete and triumphant development. Without having relinquished any part of their individuality, the States have more than doubled already, and are increasing in numbers and grow-

ing in political strength and expansion more rapidly than ever before. Without having absorbed any State, or having even encroached on any State, the Confederation has opened itself so as to embrace all the new members who have come; and now, with capacity for further and indefinite enlargement, has become fixed, enduring, and perpetual. Although it was doubted, only half a century ago, whether our political system could be maintained at all, and whether, if maintained, it could guaranty the peace and happiness of society, it stands now confessed by the world the form of government not only most adapted to empire, but also most congenial with the constitution of human nature.

"When we consider that the nation has been conducted to this haven, not only through stormy seas, but altogether also without a course and without a star; and when we consider, moreover, the sum of happiness that has already been enjoyed by the American people, and still more the influence which the great achievement is exerting on the advancement and melioration of the condition of mankind, we see at once that it might have satisfied the highest ambition to have been, no matter how humbly, concerned in so great a transaction.

"Certainly, sir, no one will assert that Henry Clay in that transaction performed an obscure, or even a common part. On the contrary, from the day in which he entered the public service, until that on which he passed the gates of death, he was never a follower, but always a leader: and he marshaled either the party which sustained, or that which resisted, every great measure, equally in the Senate and in the popular canvass. And he led where duty seemed to him to indicate, reckless whether he encountered one President or twenty Presidents, whether he was opposed by faction or even by the whole people. Hence it has happened that, although that people are not yet agreed among themselves on the wisdom of all or perhaps of even any of his great measures, yet they are nevertheless unanimous in acknowledging that he was at once the greatest, the most faithful, and the most reliable of their statesmen. Here the effort at discriminating praise of Henry Clay in regard to his public policy must stop, even on this sad occasion, which awakens the ardent liberality of his generous survivors.

"But his personal qualities may be discussed without apprehension. What were the elements of the success of that extraordinary man? You, sir, knew him longer and better than I, and I would prefer to hear you speak of them. He was indeed eloquent—all the world knows that. He held the keys to the hearts of his countrymen, and he turned the wards within them with a skill attained by no other master.

"But eloquence was nevertheless only an instrument, and one of many that he used. His conversation, his gestures, his very

look, was magisterial, persuasive, seductive, irresistible. And his appliance of all these was courteous, patient, and indefatigable. Defeat only inspired him with new resolution. He divided opposition by his assiduity of address, while he rallied and strengthened his own bands of supporters by the confidence of success which, feeling himself, he easily inspired among his followers. His affections were high, and pure, and generous, and the chiefest among them was that one which the great Italian poet designated as the charity of native land. In him that charity was an enduring and overpowering enthusiasm, and it influenced all his sentiments and conduct, rendering him more impartial between conflicting interests and sections, than any other statesman who has lived since the Revolution. Thus, with great versatility of talent, and the most catholic equality of favor, he identified every question, whether of domestic administration or foreign policy, with his own great name, and so became a perpetual tribune of the people. He needed only to pronounce in favor of a measure or against it, here, and immediately popular enthusiasm, excited as by a magic wand, was felt, overcoming and dissolving all opposition in the Senate-Chamber.

"In this way he wrought a change in our political system, that I think was not foreseen by its founders. He converted this branch of the Legislature from a negative position, or one of equilibrium between the Executive and the House of Representatives, into the active ruling power of the Republic. Only time can disclose whether this great innovation shall be beneficent, or even permanent.

"Certainly, sir, the great lights of the Senate have set. The obscurity is not less palpable to the country than to us, who are left to grope our uncertain way here, as in a labyrinth, oppressed with self-distrust. The time, too, presents new embarrassments. We are rising to another and more sublime stage of national progress—that of expanding wealth and rapid territorial aggrandizement.

"Our institutions throw a broad shadow across the St. Lawrence, and, stretching beyond the valley of Mexico, reach even to the plains of Central America, while the Sandwich Islands and the shores of China recognize their renovating influence. Wherever that influence is felt, a desire for protection under those institutions is awakened. Expansion seems to be regulated not by any difficulties of resistance, but by the moderation which results from our own internal constitution. No one knows how rapidly that restraint may give way. Who can tell how far or how fast it ought to yield? Commerce has brought the ancient continents near to us, and created necessities for new positions—perhaps connections or colonies there—and with the trade and friendship of the elder nations, their conflicts and col-

lisions are brought to our doors and to our hearts. Our sympathy kindles, or indifference extinguishes, the fires of freedom in foreign lands. Before we shall be fully conscious that a change is going on in Europe, we may find ourselves once more divided by that eternal line of separation that leaves on the one side those of our citizens who obey the impulses of sympathy, while on the other are found those who submit only to the counsels of prudence. Even prudence will soon be required to decide whether distant regions, East and West, shall come under our own protection, or be left to aggrandize a rapidly-spreading domain of hostile despotism.

"Sir, who among us is equal to these mighty questions? I fear there is no one. Nevertheless, the example of Henry Clay remains for our instruction. His genius has passed to the realms of light, but his virtues still live here for our emulation. With them there will remain also the protection and favor of the Most High, if by the practice of justice and the maintenance of freedom we shall deserve them. Let, then, the bier pass on. We will follow with sorrow, but not without hope, the reverend form that it bears to its final resting-place; and then, when that grave opens at our feet to receive so estimable a treasure, we will invoke the God of our fathers to send us new guides, like him that is now withdrawn, and give us wisdom to obey their instructions."

REMARKS OF MR. G. W. JONES.*

"Mr. President: Of the vast number who mourn the departure of the great man whose voice has so often been heard in this Hall, I have peculiar cause to regret that dispensation which has removed him from among us. He was the guardian and director of my collegiate days; four of his sons were my college-mates and warm friends. My intercourse with the father was that of a youth and a friendly adviser. I shall never cease to feel grateful to him—to his now heart-stricken and bereaved widow and children, for their many kindnesses to me during four or five years of my life. I had the pleasure of renewing my acquaintance with him, first, as a delegate in Congress, while he was a member of this body from 1835 to 1839, and again in 1849, as a member of this branch of Congress; and during the whole of which period, some eight years, none but the most kindly feeling existed between us.

"As an humble and unimportant senator, it was my fortune to co-operate with him throughout the whole of the exciting session of 1849–50—the labor and excitement of which is said to have precipitated his decease. That co-operation did not end with the accordant vote on this floor, but, in consequence of the unyielding opposition to the series of measures known as the 'Com-

* George W. Jones, of Iowa.

promise,' extended to many private meetings held by its friends, at all of which Mr. Clay was present. And whether in public or private life, he everywhere continued to inspire me with the most exalted estimate of his patriotism and statesmanship. Never shall I forget the many ardent appeals he made to senators, in and out of the Senate, in favor of the settlement of our then unhappy sectional differences.

"Immediately after the close of that memorable session of Congress, during which the nation beheld his great and almost superhuman efforts upon this floor to sustain the wise counsels of the 'Father of his Country,' I accompanied him home to Ashland, at his invitation, to revisit the place where my happiest days had been spent, with the friends who there continued to reside. During that, to me, most agreeable and instructive journey, in many conversations, he evinced the utmost solicitude for the welfare and honor of the Republic, all tending to show that he believed the happiness of the people and the cause of liberty throughout the world depended upon the continuance of our glorious Union, and the avoidance of those sectional dissensions which could but alienate the affections of one portion of the people from another. With the sincerity and fervor of a true patriot, he warned his companions in that journey to withhold all aid from men who labored, and from every cause which tended, to sow the seeds of disunion in the land; and to oppose such, he declared himself willing to forego all the ties and associations of mere party.

"At a subsequent period, sir, this friend of my youth, at my earnest and repeated entreaties, consented to take a sea-voyage from New York to Havana. He remained at the latter place a fortnight, and then returned by New Orleans to Ashland. That excursion by sea, he assured me, contributed much to relieve him from the sufferings occasioned by the disease which has just terminated his eventful and glorious life. Would to Heaven that he could have been persuaded to abandon his duties as a senator, and to have remained during the past winter and spring upon that Island of Cuba! The country would not now, perhaps, have been called to mourn his loss.

"In some matters of policy connected with the administration of our General Government, I have disagreed with him, yet the purity and sincerity of his motives I have never doubted; and as a true lover of his country, as an honorable and honest man, I trust his example will be reverenced and followed by the men of this and of succeeding generations."

REMARKS OF MR. BROOKE.*

"Mr. President: As an ardent personal admirer and political friend of the distinguished dead, I claim the privilege of adding

* Walter Brooke, of Mississippi.

my humble tribute of respect to his memory, and of joining in the general expression of sorrow that has gone forth from this Chamber. Death, at all times, is an instructive monitor as well as a mournful messenger; but when his fatal shaft hath stricken down the great in intellect and renown, how doubly impressive the lesson that it brings home to the heart that the grave is the common lot of all—the great leveler of all earthly distinctions! But at the same time we are taught that in one sense the good and great can never die; for the memory of their virtues and their bright example will live through all coming time in an immortality that blooms beyond the grave. The consolation of this thought may calm our sorrow; and, in the language of one of our own poets, it may be asked:

> "'Why weep ye, then, for him, who, having run
> The bound of man's appointed years, at last
> Life's blessings all enjoyed, life's labors done,
> Serenely to his final rest has passed;
> While the soft memory of his virtues yet
> Lingers, like twilight hues when the bright sun has set?'

"It would be doing no injustice, sir, to the living or the dead to say that no better specimen of the true American character can be found in our history than that of Mr. Clay. With no adventitious advantages of birth or fortune, he won his way by the efforts of his own genius to the highest distinction and honor. Ardently attached to the principles of civil and religious liberty, patriotism was with him both a passion and a sentiment—a passion that gave energy to his ambition, and a sentiment that pervaded all his thoughts and actions, concentrating them upon his country as the idol of his heart. The bold and manly frankness in the expression of his opinions which always characterized him has often been the subject of remark; and in all his victories it may be truly said he never 'stooped to conquer.' In his long and brilliant political career, personal considerations never for a single instant caused him to swerve from the strict line of duty, and none have ever doubted his deep sincerity in that memorable expression to Mr. Preston, 'Sir, I had rather be right than be President.'

"This is not the time nor the occasion, sir, to enter into a detail of the public services of Mr. Clay, interwoven as they are with the history of the country for half a century; but I can not refrain from adverting to the last crowning act of his glorious life—his great effort in the Thirty-first Congress for the preservation of the peace and integrity of this great Republic—as it was this effort that shattered his bodily strength and hastened the consummation of death. The Union of the States, as being essential to our prosperity and happiness, was the paramount proposition in his political creed, and the slightest symptom of danger to its perpetuity filled him with alarm and called forth

all the energies of his body and mind. In his earlier life he had met this danger and overcome it. In the conflict of contending factions it again appeared; and, coming forth from the repose of private life, to which age and infirmity had carried him, with unabated strength of intellect, he again entered upon the arena of political strife, and again success crowned his efforts, and peace and harmony were restored to a distracted people. But, unequal to the mighty struggle, his bodily strength sank beneath it, and he retired from the field of his glory to yield up his life as a holy sacrifice to his beloved country. It has well been said that peace has its victories as well as war; and how bright upon the page of history will be the record of this great victory of intellect, of reason, and of moral suasion, over the spirit of discord and sectional animosities!

"We this day, Mr. President, commit his memory to the regard and affection of his admiring countrymen. It is a consolation to them and to us to know that he died in full possession of his glorious intellect, and, what is better, in the enjoyment of that 'peace which the world can neither give nor take away.' He sank to rest as the full-orbed king of day, unshorn of a single beam, or rather like the planet of morning, his brightness was but eclipsed by the opening to him of a more full and perfect day—

> "'No waning of fire, no paling of ray,
> But rising, still rising, as passing away;
> Farewell, gallant eagle, thou 'rt buried in light—
> God speed thee to heaven, lost star of our night.'"

The resolutions were unanimously adopted, and, in pursuance thereof, the President *pro tem.* made the following appointments:

Committee of Arrangements:

Mr. Hunter,	Mr. Jones, of Iowa,	Mr. Bright,
Mr. Dawson,	Mr. Cooper,	Mr. Smith.

Pall-Bearers:

Mr. Cass,	Mr. Dodge, of Wis.,	Mr. Atchison,
Mr. Mangum,	Mr. Pratt,	Mr. Bell.

Committee to attend the remains of the deceased to Kentucky:

Mr. Underwood,	Mr. Cass,	Mr. Houston,
Mr. Jones, of Tenn.,	Mr. Fish,	Mr. Stockton.

On motion by Mr. Underwood, it was

"*Resolved*, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn."*

The Funeral at the Capitol.

Pursuant to the order of the Senate, as appointed the day previous, the Funeral of Mr. Clay was celebrated at the Capitol,

* For eulogies pronounced in the House of Representatives, see Appendix, note E, page 413.

Thursday, July 1, 1852. The procession was formed at the National Hotel, where the remains of the illustrious deceased awaited the last honors of man to man. It was composed of public bodies and associations, the military, civic authorities, public functionaries, foreign and American, and a long line of strangers and citizens, who followed the body to the Senate Chamber, where the funeral service, as appointed by the Episcopal Church, was read, and a sermon preached, by the Rev. Dr. Butler, Chaplain of the Senate.

The President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives were seated with the President of the Senate. The body of the Senate, the representatives of State sovereignties, were grouped, on the two innermost semicircular rows of chairs, around the lifeless form of their late colleague. The committee of arrangements, and the committee to convey the body to Kentucky, and the pall-bearers, with the Kentucky delegation in the House of Representatives, as chief mourners, and a few personal devoted friends, were also in close proximity to the inanimate form of the deceased.

The members of the House of Representatives filled the outer circles, except such parts as were devoted to the large diplomatic corps, the Cabinet of the President of the United States, the officers of the Army and Navy, among whom were Major-General Scott, commander-in-chief, and Commodore Morris. With the Municipal Councils of the city of Washington, were the officers of neighboring cities, and others, official and unofficial.

The sarcophagus in which the remains were inurned, resembled the outlines of the human body. The handles, the face-plate, the plate for inscribing the name, and other plates, were of massive silver, beautifully wrought and chased, having appropriate emblems, among which appeared wreaths of laurel and oak with a full-blown rose, and sprig of oak with its acorns detached from their parent stem, showing the work of the fell destroyer.

The Rev. Chaplain took for his text the following words of the prophet Jeremiah, chapter xlviii., 17: "How is the strong staff broken, and the beautiful rod!" and he proceeded to say:

"Before all hearts and minds in this august assemblage, the vivid image of ONE MAN stands. To some aged eye he may come forth, from the dim past, as he appeared in the neighboring city of his native State, a lithe and ardent youth, full of promise, of ambition, and of hope. To another, he may appear as, in a

distant State, in the courts of justice, erect, high-strung, bold, wearing fresh forensic laurels on his young and open brow. Some may see him in the earlier, and some in the later stages of his career on this auspicious theater of his renown; and to the former he will start out, on the back-ground of the past, as he appeared in the neighboring Chamber, tall, elate, impassioned, with flashing eye and suasive gesture, and clarion voice, an already acknowledged 'Agamemnon, King of Men;' and to others he will again stand in this Chamber 'the strong staff' of the bewildered and staggering State, and 'the beautiful rod,' rich with the blossoms of genius, and of patriotic love and hope, the life of youth still remaining to give animation, grace, and exhaustless vigor, to the wisdom, the experience, and gravity of age. To others he may be present as he sat in the chamber of sickness, cheerful, majestic, gentle—his mind clear, his heart warm, his hope fixed on heaven, peacefully preparing for his last great change. To the memory of the minister of God, he appears as the penitent, humble, and trusting Christian, who received him with the affection of a father, and joined with him in solemn sacrament and prayer with the gentleness of a woman and humility of a child. 'Out of the strong came forth sweetness.' 'How is the strong staff broken and the beautiful rod!' But not before this assembly only does the venerable image of the departed statesman this day distinctly stand. For more than a thousand miles—East, West, North, and South—it is known and remembered, that at this place and hour a nation's representatives assemble to do honor to him whose fame is now a nation's heritage. A nation's mighty heart throbs against this Capitol, and beats through you. In many cities, banners droop, bells toll, cannons boom, funeral draperies wave. In crowded streets and on surrounding wharves, upon steamboats, and upon cars, in fields, in workshops, in homes, in schools, millions of men, women, and children, have their thoughts fixed upon this scene, and say mournfully to each other, 'This is the hour in which, at the capital, the nation's representatives are burying Henry Clay.' Burying Henry Clay! Bury the records of your country's history—bury the hearts of living millions—bury the mountains, the rivers, the lakes, and the spreading lands from sea to sea, with which his name is inseparably associated, and even then you would not bury Henry Clay—for he is in other lands, and speaks in other tongues, and to other times, than ours.

"A great mind, a great heart, a great orator, a great career, have been consigned to history. She will record his rare gifts of deep insight, keen discrimination, clear statement, rapid combination, plain, direct, and convincing logic. She will love to dwell on that large, generous, magnanimous, open, forgiving heart. She will linger with fond delight on the recorded of

traditional stories of an eloquence that was so masterly and stirring, because it was but himself struggling to come forth in the living words—because, though the words were brave and strong, and beautiful and melodious, it was felt that behind them, there was a soul, braver, stronger, more beautiful, and more melodious than language could express. She will point to a career of statesmanship which has, to a remarkable degree, stamped itself on the public policy of the country, and reached in beneficent practical results the fields, the looms, the commercial marts, and the quiet homes of all the land, where his name was with the departed father, and is with the living children, and will be with successive generations, an honored household word.

"I feel, as a man, the grandeur of his career. But as an immortal, with this broken wreck of mortality before me, with this scene as the 'end-all' of human glory, I feel that no career is truly great but that of him who, whether he be illustrious or obscure, lives to the future in the present, and, linking himself to the spiritual world, draws from God the life, the rule, the motive, and the reward of all his labor. So would that great spirit which has departed say to us, could he address us now. So did he realize in the calm and meditative close of life. I feel that I but utter the lessons which, when living, were his last and best convictions, and which, dead, could he speak to us, his solemn admonitions, when I say that statesmanship is then only glorious when it is Christian, and that man is then only safe and true to his duty and his soul, when the life which he lives in the flesh is the life of faith in the Son of God.

"Great, indeed, is the privilege, and most honorable and useful is the career of a Christian American statesman.

"He perceives that civil liberty came from the freedom wherewith Christ made its earliest martyr and defender free. He recognizes it as one of the twelve manner of fruits on the tree of life which, while its lower branches furnish the best nutriment of earth, hangs on its topmost boughs, which wave in heaven, fruits that exhilarate the immortals. Recognizing the State as God's institution, he will perceive that his own ministry is Divine. Living consciously under the eye and in the love and fear of God, redeemed by the blood of Jesus, sanctified by His Spirit, loving His law, he will give himself, in private and in public, to the service of his Saviour. He will not admit that he may act on less lofty principles in public than in private life, and that he must be careful of his moral influence in the small sphere of home and neighborhood, but need take no care of it when it stretches over continents and across seas. He will know that his moral responsibility can not be divided and distributed among others. When he is told that adherence to the strictest moral and religious principle is incompatible with a suc-

cessful and eminent career, he will denounce the assertion as a libel on the venerated father of the Republic—a libel on the honored living, and the illustrious dead—a libel against a great and Christian nation—a libel against God Himself, who has declared and made 'godliness profitable for the life that is.' He will strive to make laws transcripts of the character and institutions, illustrations of the providence of God. He will scan with admiration and awe the purposes of God in the future history of the world, in throwing open this wide continent, from sea to sea, as the abode of freedom, intelligence, plenty, prosperity, and peace, and feel that, in giving his energies with a patriotic love to the welfare of his country, he is consecrating himself with a Christian's zeal to the extension and establishment of the Redeemer's kingdom. Compared with a career like this, which is equally open to those whose public sphere is large or small, how paltry are the trade of politicians, the tricks of statesmanship. the rewards of successful baseness! This hour, this scene, the venerated dead, the country, the world, the present, the future, God, duty, heaven, hell, speak trumpet-tongued to all in the service of their country, to *beware* how they lay polluted or unhallowed hands

"'Upon the ark
Of her magnificent and awful cause.'

"Such is the character of that statesmanship which alone would have met the full approval of the venerated dead. For the religion which always had a place in the convictions of his mind had also, within a recent period, entered into his experience and seated itself in his heart. Twenty years since, he wrote: 'I am a member of no religious sect, and I am not a professor of religion. I regret that I am not. I wish that I was, and trust that I shall be. I have, and always have had a profound regard for Christianity, the religion of my fathers, and for its rites, its usages, and observances.' That feeling proved that the seed sown by pious parents was not dead, though stifled. A few years since, its dormant life was re-awakened. He was baptized in the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and during his sojourn in this city he was in full communion with Trinity parish.

"It is since his withdrawal from the sittings of the Senate, that I have been made particularly acquainted with his religious opinions, character and feelings. From his first illness, he expressed to me the persuasion that it would be fatal. From that period until his death, it has been my privilege to hold with him frequent religious services, and conversations with him in his room. He averred to me his full faith in the great leading doctrines of the Gospel—the fall and sinfulness of man, the divinity of Christ, the reality and necessity of atonement, the need of being born again by the Spirit, and salvation through

faith in the crucified Redeemer. His own personal hopes of salvation, he ever and distinctly based on the promises and the grace of Christ. Strikingly perceptible on his naturally impetuous and impatient character, was the influence of Grace in producing submission and 'patient waiting for Christ,' and for death. On one occasion, he spoke to me of the pious example of one very near and dear to him, as that which led him deeply to feel and earnestly to seek for himself the reality and blessedness of religion. On one occasion, he told me that he had been striving to form a conception of Heaven; and he enlarged upon the mercy of that provision by which our Saviour became a partaker of our humanity, that our hearts and hopes might fix themselves on Him. On another occasion, when he was supposed to be very near his end, I expressed to him the hope that his mind and heart were at peace, and that he was able to rest with cheerful confidence on the promises and merits of the Redeemer. He said, with much feeling, that he endeavored to, and trusted that he did repose his salvation upon Christ; that it was too late for him to look at Christianity in the light of speculation; that he had never doubted of its truth; and that he now wished to throw himself upon it as a practical and blessed remedy. Very soon after this, I administered to him the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Being extremely feeble, and desirous of having his mind undiverted, no persons were present but his son and servant. It was a scene long to be remembered. There, in that still chamber, at a week-day noon, the tides of life all flowing strong around us, three disciples of the Saviour—the minister of God, the dying statesman, and his servant, a partaker of the like precious faith—commemorated their Saviour's dying love. He joined in the blessed sacrament with great feeling and solemnity—now pressing his hands together, and now spreading them forth, as the words of the service expressed the feelings, desires, supplications, and thanksgivings of his heart. After this he rallied, and again I was permitted frequently to join with him in religious services, conversation, and prayer. He grew in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Among the books which he read most, were Jay's Morning and Evening Exercises, the Life of Dr. Chalmers, and the Christian Philosopher Triumphant in Death. His hope continued to the end, though true and real, to be tremulous with humility rather than rapturous with assurance. When he felt most the weariness of his protracted sufferings, it sufficed to suggest to him that his Heavenly Father doubtless knew that, after a life so long, stirring, and tempted, such a discipline of chastening and suffering was needful to make him meet for the inheritance of the saints; and at once the words of meek and patient acquiescence escaped his lips.

"Exhausted nature at length gave way. On the last occasion when I was permitted to offer a brief prayer at his bedside, his last words to me were that he had hope only in Christ, and that the prayer which I had offered for His pardoning love and His sanctifying grace, included every thing which the dying need. On the evening previous to his departure, sitting an hour in silence by his side, I could not but realize, when I heard him in the slight wanderings of his mind to other days, and other scenes, murmuring the words, '*My mother! mother! mother!*' and saying '*My dear wife,*' as if she were present; I could not but realize then, and rejoice to think how near was the blessed reunion of his heart with the loved dead and with her—our dear Lord gently smooth her passage to the tomb!—who must soon follow him to his rest, whose spirits even then seemed to visit and to cheer his memory and his hope. Gently he breathed his soul away into the spirit world.

"'How bless'd the righteous when they die!
When holy souls retire to rest,
How mildly beams the closing eye!
How gently heaves the expiring breast!

"'So fades a summer cloud away;
So sinks the gale when storms are o'er;
So gently shuts the eye of day;
So dies the wave upon the shore!'

"Be it ours to follow him in the same humble and submissive faith to Heaven. Could he speak to us the counsels of his latest human and of his present heavenly experience, sure I am that he would not only admonish us to cling to the Saviour in sickness and in death, but abjure us not to delay to act upon our first convictions, that we might give our best power and fullest influence for God, and go to the grave with a hope unshadowed by the long worldliness of the past, and darkened by no films of fear and doubt resting over the future!

"The strong staff is broken, and the beautiful rod despoiled of its grace and bloom; but in the light of the eternal promises, and by the power of Christ's resurrection, we joyfully anticipate the prospect of seeing that broken staff erect, and that beautiful rod, clothed with celestial grace, and blossoming with undying life and blessedness, in the paradise of God."

The funeral cortège, appointed by the Senate to accompany the remains of Mr. Clay to Lexington, Kentucky, with numerous friends of the deceased, left Washington after the solemn services at the Capitol were concluded, and proceeded on their mournful journey, by way of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Buffalo, Lake Erie, Cleveland, Columbus, Cin-

cinnati, Louisville, and Frankfort, arriving at Lexington Friday evening at sundown, the 9th of July. After the ceremonies of reception by the Committee of Lexington, from the charge of the Committee of the Senate, the body was escorted to Ashland by the military, and an immense concourse of people, and deposited there in charge of the heart-stricken widow and the bereaved family. The final obsequies were celebrated on Saturday, the 10th of July, an account of which will be found in the Appendix.*

* See Note F, page 438.

CHAPTER XIV.

RÉSUMÉ OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF HENRY CLAY.

"The Mill-Boy of the Slashes" of Hanover, in Virginia, was of humble but respectable origin. His shop-training behind the counter at Richmond, Virginia, was a brief apprenticeship, and could not be put down as having an important influence on his future life, except as a stepping-stone to a clerkship in the office of the High Court of Chancery of Virginia, where he attracted the attention of Chancellor Wythe, who solicited and obtained his occasional services in the capacity of an amanuensis. It was this relation which introduced the lad to the chances of a high destiny, all, as ever after, depending on himself. He interested and pleased the Chancellor, and became useful, we might say, indispensable to him, and the Chancellor, in turn, was disposed to serve the boy. The discovery and encouragement of talent must be a high gratification to a benevolent mind. It did not take long for Chancellor Wythe, being in daily and intimate contact with this youth of fifteen, to discover his character and promise, and the Chancellor knew how to give him advice for the occupation of his leisure hours. Thus naturally and pleasantly, by mutual attraction, the amanuensis became a pupil, and next the companion of a venerable judge, without interrupting his duties as clerk in the office of the Court of Chancery. Four years of such a relation, in these two quarters, passed on, and in the mean time the youth had attained a high reputation in a debating club, which had been formed in Richmond by his instrumentality. Common prophecy began to mark out for him an elevated career. By the influence of Chancellor Wythe, he had become a student at law under Attorney-General Brooke, and having obtained his license from the Court, in his twenty-first year, he followed his mother to Kentucky in 1797, whither she and his step-father, Captain Watkins, had removed. A poor young man, without a penny in his pocket, he opened his office

in Lexington, which, from that day, became his home, and, as we have seen, he was buried there in 1852, fifty-five years after he had entered the place as a young lawyer. In a speech delivered at Lexington, on his retirement from the Senate, in 1842, he told the people then how much pleasure he had on receiving his first fee as a lawyer—fifteen shillings—for he was then in need of it. But he soon rushed into a lucrative practice.

The youth, Henry Clay, had acquired a brilliant reputation before he left Richmond; but what was of great importance to him in after life, he had formed acquaintances there, several of whom rose to eminence in the State and in the nation, such as John Marshall, afterward Chief Justice of the United States, Edward Pendleton, Spencer Roane, Bushrod Washington, and many others known to fame. The PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE OF HENRY CLAY, in which Chief Justice Marshall and Judge Brooke figure so considerably, will indicate the importance of these early friendships, and the deep personal interest which the parties felt in each other through life.

The early marriage of Mr. Clay, at the age of twenty-two, to a daughter of Colonel Hart, of Lexington, four years younger than himself, contributed greatly to the respectability of his position and to the weight of his character. He had eleven children, six daughters and five sons, and left Mrs. Clay a widow, with only four of the eleven children remaining, Theodore Wythe, Thomas H., James B., and John M. Clay, aged relatively in the order here named. Two of the daughters died in infancy, two at fourteen, and two after they were married and had children. Colonel Henry Clay fell at the battle of Buena Vista, leaving a family. Thomas H. and James B. Clay both have families. In 1845 Mr. Clay had fifteen grand-children, with some increase since that time, whether in number we can not say, as some have died.

It is not improbable that Mr. Clay would have remained in Virginia, and spent his life there, if Captain Watkins, his step-father, had not removed to Kentucky. It was natural that a son of such filial regard, should follow his mother. The fame of "The Mill-Boy of the Slashes" was acquired in the service of his mother. The Rev. Dr. Butler tells us, in his funeral sermon at the Capitol, that, while sitting by the bedside of Mr. Clay the night before he died, he heard him say, apparently in the wanderings of his mind back to other days, unconscious of the pres-

ence of other persons, and probably unconscious of his present condition, "My mother! mother! mother!" And then, as if his wife were present, he would say, "My dear wife!" It was such a heart, uttering its filial affection in the struggles of death, so long after his mother was dead, himself now a man of seventy-five, that followed the mother to Kentucky. But for that, Virginia might have had her son to the last, and she would have honored him. She would never have rejected him, as she afterward did.

On the hypothesis that Henry Clay had remained in Virginia, and grown up a son and citizen of that State, and lived and enacted his part, and made his grave there, he would undoubtedly have risen to control the policy of the State, with equal influence, probably, on that of the nation, as that which he exercised in his actual career. That influence might even have been greater. It is natural to suppose, on this hypothesis, that Virginia would have had a very different history, and that she might have retained her leading influence in the family of States, with Henry Clay as her guiding star. He would have evoked the hidden treasures of her wealth, and kept her forward as the Empire State, in her political importance, if not in her commercial grandeur. Her water-power at the city of Richmond alone, is sufficient to have built a Lowell there, and there is no counting her dormant wealth of this description, and of others scattered over the State—all of which lies in abeyance to such a train of enterprise as Mr. Clay would have guided her to. She boasts of one Washington. If Mr. Clay had stayed with her, she might have boasted of another; for he, too, could have been no other than a national man. But how has Virginia fallen short of such a destiny, by the narrow views of her leading statesmen!

But the transplanting of Virginia's son in the far West, gave character to the West, gave character to Kentucky, not because he came from Virginia, or owed any virtue to her soil and atmosphere; but because the Creator had gifted him with rare endowments, such as men anywhere would recognize and honor—such as any State, any country, might well be proud of. Kentucky, no doubt, was destined to be a great and noble State from her geographical position, and from the character of her people; but her people will not deny how much they owe to her adopted son for her chivalrous character, and for her weight in the counsels of the nation. It was, doubtless, a proper appreciation of Mr. Clay that elevated the tone of her character, and made her

what she could not otherwise have been. The influence was reciprocal, flowing from noble hearts on both sides; but it was a single heart that touched the many hearts, to prompt those generous impulses, which might otherwise have lain dormant, and which, by continued concentration on such an object, ever before the public eye, acquired a vigor which made itself felt as widely as the fame of the favorite had spread, following in the same track, and diffusing itself over the same field. And not only Kentucky, but the great West owes not a little of its importance, of its weight in the scale of public policy, and of its rapidly growing consequence, to the fame and influence of HARRY OF THE WEST. It was fit that the waning commonwealth of Virginia should part with a star, which could not find room for its orbit in her limits, and which was destined to shed its light on the whole Western hemisphere—on the world. The great West was its appropriate field in which to rise and set, while its circuit embraced the East, and the South, and the North, and the American Occident.

It did not take long for the people of Lexington, and of the country around, to discover, on the advent of Henry Clay, that they had a young man in the midst of them, of whom they might entertain high hopes, and be justly proud. His professional practice and its emoluments grew upon his hands with unexampled rapidity. His eloquence at the bar attracted crowds, and his influencee with juries and with the Court was such, that clients flocked to his office to commit their cause to his hands. In one instance, on the rehearing of a cause, he obtained a decision against the record of the Court, who, on being referred to it, said it could not be so. They had been persuaded against their own convictions, and their first decision was right. How, then, could the second be right? A lawyer employed Mr. Clay to assist him in an important case where much was at stake, but in the mean time he became anxious about it, because he could not see that Mr. Clay was giving proper attention to it. On riding to court in another county, while in the saddle, Mr. Clay asked the lawyer to show the case by the file of papers belonging to it, which he did, one by one, to the end. "That 'll do," said Mr. Clay, and the file of papers was restored to the saddle-bags, and they rode on to the county seat where the cause was to be tried next day. As the lawyer thought, Mr. Clay appeared to pay no more attention to the subject, but was engaged in excit-

ing company till the cause came on. The lawyer gave up the cause as lost. What was his astonishment when he found Mr. Clay possessed of every point in the case, and complete master of the argument! The cause was gained. "How is this?" said the lawyer to Mr. Clay. "I never could see when or how you studied the case, and I expected to lose it." "Why," said Mr. Clay, "if you ever want me to help you, you must let me have my own way." This may, perhaps, serve to show the celerity of action, and the intuitive grasp of Mr. Clay's mind, on a given case, when the facts and the law were in his possession.

To this add the consideration of his persuasive powers, and the secret of his success at the bar is revealed. Some may, perhaps, imagine that Mr. Clay was not a student. This is not true. His history at Richmond demonstrates the immense acquisitions he made in legal learning while there; and it is believed he never undertook a cause in court without legal research, if he needed it. But his method of preparation was, doubtless, peculiar to himself. His intuitive discernment taught him what and how much law was wanted for a particular case, and his skill as an advocate brought it to bear directly on the facts; and his vast persuasive powers always made the most effective use of the law and the facts with a court or jury. Mr. Clay's legal acquirements came quick and fast, because he was a rapid reader and a vigilant observer of the uses made of legal knowledge by others of his profession; and, once in his mind, he never lost them. As in common life, so in the law, his knowledge was all practical. If not so learned as some that might be named, his learning was always ready for use; and no one, probably, could say that Mr. Clay was ever found engaged in a cause for which he was not prepared. What more could or need be said to prove a man a lawyer?

Mr. Clay excelled as an advocate for criminals, before a jury. It was in this field that his great powers of persuasion, if he had any good ground of argument, carried all before him. Mr. Clay's defense of Charles Wickliffe, who killed Mr. Benning, Editor of the Kentucky *Gazette*, is one of his most remarkable achievments of this kind.* There was some ground of argument for justifiable homicide; and Mr. Clay felt it to be his duty to try and save the young man, and he did save him. A more exciting trial of the kind was probably never witnessed; and it

* Vol I., Life and Times, p. 90.

was Mr. Clay's matchless eloquence that made it so. There were several other criminal trials of very great interest in which Mr. Clay was engaged.*

It was natural enough that Mr. Clay's talents and popularity should carry him into the State Legislature at an early period. He served there seven sessions, and was elected Speaker of the General Assembly. In 1806 he was elected senator of the United States, to fill a vacancy extending to March 4 1807, during the whole of which he was under thirty years of age—which is the term prescribed by the Constitution as one of the qualifications for a seat in the Senate. But his age not having been challenged, he had no occasion to say, as John Randolph did, when he first appeared a stripling, in the House of Representatives, "Ask my constituents."

During this session Mr. Clay made an able speech on Internal Improvements, which has not been preserved, which is the more to be regretted at it was one of his first efforts—the first in Congress—on this subject.

It was this year, 1806, that Mr. Clay was invoked by Colonel Burr, to defend him against the charge of treason, to which he consented, and which afterward occasioned him some trouble from political opponents, who accused him of sympathizing with Colonel Burr.† Nothing, however, could be more absurd than such a charge. Mr. Clay, at first, on the solemn protestation of Burr himself, and in part, perhaps, from his own kind, credulous disposition, believed Colonel Burr to be innocent, though from evidence adduced, he afterward changed his mind, and was forced to admit Colonel Burr's complicity, at least, in the treason alleged, and that Burr entertained and furthered unlawful designs against the United States. Mr. Clay, however, in the circumstances of the case, could do no less than appear as Colonel Burr's counsel, and he obtained a verdict of acquittal for him in his first trial in Kentucky.

In 1809, Mr Clay was again returned to the Senate of the United States, and served there through the 13th Congress, that is, two sessions, to March 4, 1811. Three speeches made by him during this Congress are preserved, one on *Domestic Manufactures*, delivered April 6, 1810; one on the line of the *Perdido*, delivered December 25, 1810; and the other against the

* Vol. I., Life and Times, p. 84, and onward.

† See Private Correspondence, pp. 13 and 14, and Vol. I., Life and Times, p. 87.

re-charter of the *United States Bank*, delivered in 1811. On the first of these topics Mr. Clay had before spoken, in the Legislature of Kentucky, and advocated domestic manufactures as a State policy. The line of the Perdido was a national question between the United States and Spain, involving much historical research, the results of which are well condensed in Mr. Clay's speech on the subject. His object was to vindicate the acts of Mr. Madison, as President of the United States, in taking possession of a disputed territory up to the line of the Perdido. His speech against the re-charter of the United States Bank is one of considerable interest, as a contrast to the opinion which he afterward adopted and advocated in favor of the bank.

The country being, apparently, on the eve of a war with Great Britain, a general wish was expressed that Mr. Clay might go into the House of Representatives, as a position to which, at such a crisis, it was thought he was especially adapted—a judgment which was afterward proved to be eminently correct. He was accordingly persuaded to decline the high dignity of a senator of the United States, and to accept a return, from his own Congressional district, to the House of Representatives, in 1811, for the 12th Congress. All eyes were turned to him as a candidate for the speakership, and he was carried into the chair on the first ballot by a majority of thirty-one in a House of one hundred and twenty-eight members. He was elected six times after this, in all, seven, and served thirteen years as Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, before he went into the State Department in 1825, having been absent a year as Commissioner, at Ghent; and during the 17th Congress he was forced to return to the practice of his profession to repair his dilapidated fortune, which had been seriously impaired by loaning his credit.

It was in the discharge of the functions of Speaker of the House of Representatives, and improving his opportunities while the House was in Committee of the Whole, to join in the debate, that Mr. Clay won for himself immortal fame. It was exactly the field for his talents at that period of his life. He was thirty-four years of age when first elected Speaker, and forty-eight when he retired finally from that office. He had no competitor for the place that stood any chance of election while he was a candidate. Such a Speaker, so remarkably endowed for the office, the House of Representatives never had, and it

probably never will have his equal again. There was scarcely a man or boy in the nation that could not recite or sing the following lines:

"As near the Potomac's broad stream, t' other day,
Fair LIBERTY strolled in solicitous mood,
Deep pondering the future, unheeding her way,
She met goddess NATURE beside a green wood.
'Good mother,' she cried, 'deign to help me at need;
I must make for my guardians a Speaker to-day;
The first in the world, I would give them.' 'Indeed!
When I made the first Speaker, I made him of CLAY.'"

The theater on which Mr. Clay was now placed, was one which gave full scope to his talents, and called forth all his powers. He was not only the head of the popular branch of the National Legislature, which, under his influence, became the all-potent power of the nation, and continued to be such while he occupied that position, but he came to that place at the moment when the question of war with Great Britain was pending, and which was about to be declared. So urgent was the question, that Mr. Madison called a special session of Congress, and on the fourth of November, 1811, transmitted a war message. Mr. Clay was the friend and confidant of the President at this eventful period. He stood between the national Executive and the people of the country, at the same time that he presided over the immediate representatives of the people, while in session to deliberate on these most grave and momentous affairs. Mr. Madison was wise in counsel, patriotic, firm, but timid. He felt the weight of his responsibility. All know that Mr. Clay, at that time of life, was sufficiently bold. The two characters were essential to each other in this crisis, and in the influential and commanding positions which they respectively occupied—one at the head of the nation, clothed with the nation's authority, and the other at the head of the dominant power of Congress—one wielding the executive arm, and the other with his hand on the lever to stir up the people to make that arm strong. It was a great and difficult problem as to what might be the result of a war with Great Britain. Thus stood these two potent political agencies, at this critical hour—Mr. Madison and his Cabinet, and Mr. Clay and the House of Representatives.

The Hon. William H. Seward, in his eulogy on Mr. Clay, pronounced in the Senate the day after his death, says, that Mr.

Clay "became a perpetual tribune of the people," and that, "he converted this branch of the Legislature [the Senate] from a negative position, or one of equilibrium between the Executive and the House of Representatives, into the active ruling power of the Republic."* We intend no other use of this than a recognition of the fact, that the House of Representatives under Mr. Clay, as Speaker, was a very different thing from what it has ever been since, more especially since Mr. Clay went into the Senate. Under him, the House was undoubtedly "the active ruling power of the Republic," and never more so than when he first entered it, on account of the exigences of the time. Napoleon I. was in the zenith of his power, and all Europe was in a state of war. The necessities of Great Britain, as the leading maritime power of the world, compelled her to claim her seamen, that were native-born subjects, wherever she could find them, and to *search* for them as they had strayed into the merchant service of other countries, especially of the United States, where they were most inclined to go. "The right of search," as Great Britain claimed, was vital to herself, but often fatal to American-born seamen, who were "impressed" into her service in the exercise of this right, on account of the difficulty of distinguishing between an American and an Englishmen or an Irishman; and Americans were often impressed when known to be such. The assertion and practice of this right of search had become imperious and intolerable, and the appeal made to the American Government and to the American people, by American seamen forced into the British service, and compelled to fight the battles of a foreign power, even against their own country, if war should come, was irresistable. Even the right to impress naturalized American citizens, though native-born British subjects was obnoxious. This practice of the British Government, in all its extent, had not only become a wrong, but an insult, constantly aggravated by time and manner, by reason of the impunity which had characterized its history. There were other grounds of complaint, but "Free Trade and Sailors' Rights" was the motto of the controversy with the American Government and people, and flaunted in the breeze over land and sea.

At this crisis, Mr. Clay was the war-king, to lead the House of Representatives, to lead both Houses of Congress, to lead the country. Mr. Madison and his Cabinet looked to him, and de-

* Page 251.

pended on his lead. We believe Mr. Clay carried with him through life a deep sense of the responsibility of the position which he then occupied; and hence his dread of war, when it could be honorably avoided. We see it in his whole history, in all his public counsels, whenever a speck of war appeared in the horizon, in relation to foreign powers, and more especially when internal strife threatened the peace of the country. Although we came out of the war with Great Britain unscathed, creditably, as a nation capable of war on a fit occasion, even with a power superior to ourselves in resources and in experience, and although Mr. Clay was himself as much the instrument of the peace as of the commencement of hostilities, it is yet remarkable that, in negotiating peace, not a word was said of "the right of search," which was the chief cause of the war. There were reasons for this. Our Commissioners at Ghent were gravely embarrassed.* Napoleon was dethroned and in the Isle of Elba. Peace was restored to Europe, and Great Britain was in a position to bring her entire navy and all her armies, not employed in the East, to bear upon us. A large part of our own country was still opposed to the war. It was the darkest hour in Mr. Madison's administration. What should the Commissioners do? Should they waive the question of the right of search? They were forced to do it. Nevertheless, it was understood and believed, that, practically, the question was settled against the right, that Great Britain would never enforce it again, and that, if she should, the United States would again resist. Such has been the result; and although the question was waived in negotiating peace, the object of the war was attained. So far as Mr. Clay was influential in this peace—and he is allowed to have been greatly so†—the waiving of the question of the right of search, was precisely of the same character with the Missouri Compromise of 1821: say nothing about the difference, and you will never hear any thing about it. So it happened in both cases. In vindication of the American Commissioners at Ghent, when accused of this silence, Mr. Clay afterward said, on the floor of Congress: "True, one of the great causes of the war, and of its continuance, was the practice of impressment exercised by Great Britain; and if this claim had been admitted [in the treaty] by necessary implication, or by express stipulation, the rights of

* See Private Correspondence, Chapter I.

† See Mr. Hughes' Letter to Mr. Clay, Private Correspondence, p. 505.

our seamen would have been abandoned. It is with utter astonishment that I hear it has been contended in this country, that because our right of exemption from the practice had not been expressly secured in the treaty, it was therefore given up! It is impossible that such an argument can be advanced on this floor. No member who regarded his reputation would venture to advance such a doctrine."

But Mr. Clay was the great and controlling counselor for the War of 1812. It is understood that, the day before Mr. Madison sent in his Message to Congress, recommending a Declaration of War, Mr. Clay, and a committee from the two Houses of Congress, were closeted with him for hours—Mr. Clay using his utmost persuasion—the powers of which, as all know, were not small—to overcome Mr. Madison's timidity and hesitation. The war was declared; and on the shoulders of Mr. Clay rested this tremendous responsibility; and although he bore himself gallantly through the contest, inspiring the Government with courage, prompting Congress to its duty, and animating the nation, it is no wonder that he should ever after look back to the responsibility which he then assumed, with a deep sense of its gravity, and that he should ever shrink from war, when it could be honorably avoided. We have no evidence that he ever regretted or reproached himself for the part he took in these affairs; but, on the contrary, he said in the House of Representatives, on the 29th of January, 1816: "I voted for the declaration of war. I exerted all the little influence and talent I had to make the war. The war was made. It is terminated; and I declare, with perfect sincerity, if it had been permitted to me to lift the veil of futurity, and to have foreseen the precise series of events which has occurred, my vote would have been unchanged. We had been insulted, and outraged, and spoliated upon by nearly all Europe: by Great Britain, by France, Spain, Denmark, Naples, and, to cap the climax, by the little contemptible power of Algiers. We had submitted too long and too much. We had become the scorn of foreign powers, and the derision of our own citizens."

But still the responsibility, even to think of as a matter of history, all well over, was oppressive. It contributed, no doubt vastly to make him more useful to his country in after-life. It was not in him to tolerate the wounding of the honor of the nation by a foreign power, without resentment, nor to allow its

material interests to be unjustly invaded; but subsequently to the War of 1812, he was always the man of peace. He prevented General Jackson from plunging the nation into war with France; he protested against the annexation of Texas, because it would bring on war with Mexico; and not to speak of his other efforts of this kind, whenever war clouds have arisen above the horizon, we all know what grand devices he conceived, and what stupendous endeavors he sustained, to secure the internal peace of the country against sectional animosities, and how, at last, he became a martyr to this cause.

One of the first speeches of Mr. Clay on the War of 1812, now extant, is that on the augmentation of the military force, delivered in committee of the whole of the House of Representatives, December 31, 1811, less than six months before war was declared, on a bill reported from the committee on foreign affairs, to raise thirteen additional regiments for the public service, which was passed. The first aim of the war, on land, would naturally be to invade Canada, where between seven and eight thousand British troops were posted. A part of Mr. Clay's argument, therefore, was, that, after garrisoning our seaports, it was necessary to have an army in the field against Canada, of sufficient force to overcome the British troops, to take Montreal and Quebec, and to wrest the Canadas from British dominion—a thing, however, that was never achieved.

"What are we to gain by the war? it has been emphatically asked," said Mr. Clay. "In reply, I would ask, what are we not to lose by peace? Commerce, character, a nation's best treasure, honor. * * * England is said to be fighting for the world. * * * What are we required to do by those who would engage our feelings and wishes in her behalf? To bear the actual cuffs of her arrogance, that we may escape a chimerical French subjugation. * * * We are called upon to submit to debasement, dishonor, and disgrace; to bow the neck to royal insolence, as a course of preparation for manly resistance to Gallic invasion!" We have no space for the argument; but this is a little spice of the spirit which Mr. Clay infused into his speeches at this time.

The next speech we find on record from Mr. Clay, was that delivered January 22, 1812, on the increase of the navy. It is known how the navy had dwindled down into the gun-boat system, under the Administration of Mr. Jefferson, and it was hard

work for Mr. Clay and his coadjutors to convert the Jeffersonian Democrats in Congress, to the policy of building frigates and ships of the line. A bill was reported, recommending a blank number of frigates. Mr. Cheves moved to fill up the blank with the figure TEN. This was supported by Mr. Clay, and carried by a vote of 52 to 47, though against a strenuous opposition. The frigates were built as soon as possible, and the brilliant victories which they achieved, established the character of the navy in the affections of the American people, which has never yet declined. Here, again, we have seen the fruits of Mr. Clay's eloquence ; for the bill would have stood no chance without his advocacy. It was the foundation of our navy, which has ever since been the pride and boast of the nation. This speech is one of the best framed arguments which Mr. Clay ever made. It was irresistible, and prevailed.

Again we find Mr. Clay in the field of debate on the new Army Bill, January 8, 1813, about seven months after war was declared. Our attempt on Canada in the north-west had been most disastrous, and in this state of discouragement, the opposition to the war, which from the first was considerable, had increased, and became very annoying to the Administration. The bill before the House was to raise twenty additional regiments to carry on the war more vigorously, and to retrieve the reputation of our arms. It was necessary also to raise money—the sinews of war. Money, an army, and skillful generals were the pressing needs of the hour. Our army was in disgrace, the enemy was exultant, and the nation discouraged. The opposition bore down with rebuke and sarcasm, heaping upon it reproach and fault-finding. It was accused of having undertaken a war without energy or skill to prosecute it. The country had an enemy in its face, an enemy in its own bosom, and nothing but disaster to feed its courage on.

The first dash of Mr. Clay, in this great exigency, was on the domestic foe. The country and the administration looked to him. The House of Representatives, under his guidance, was the power of the nation. It was there that the battles of the country were first to be fought, and one voice alone could lead the troop. He was wanted not only there, but Mr. Madison seriously thought of giving him a military commission, and putting him at the head of the army. With his versatility of talent, it is not unlikely that, with all his lack of experience in military tactics,

he would have gained as much reputation in the field as he has acquired in the Senate. The army wanted nothing but the inspiration, which he was eminently calculated to impart to it. He was the man to lead—in debate, or in arms. It is a remarkable fact, that General Harrison wrote to Mr. Clay and desired him to come to the army. "In my opinion," said the General, "your presence on the frontier would be productive of great advantages. I can assure you, that your advice and assistance in determining the course of operations for the army—to the command of which I have been designated by your recommendation —will be highly useful. You are not only pledged, in some manner, for my conduct, but for the success of the war. For God's sake, then, come on, as quickly as possible, and let us endeavor to throw off from the administration that weight of reproach which the late disasters will heap upon them."*

A singular coincidence of judgment this between General Harrison and Mr. Madison. The general, being in the field, invokes, even implores Mr. Clay, in a recess of Congress (it was the 30th of August, 1812), to come to him on the frontier, "to assist in determining the course of operations for the army," confiding in one who was never trained to military life, while Mr. Madison proffers to him the commission of General-in-chief. As glorious as was the career of Mr. Clay as a statesman, one can hardly but regret that, with such an opportunity, and under such auspices, he did not buckle on his sword for the war. So intuitive have his perceptions ever been, in all the practical affairs of life that have claimed his attention, and so quick and infallible his judgment, that one can not but feel that he would have dashed into a military career like a well-trained captain, and won laurels for himself in winning victories for his country. He was just the man to be loved and obeyed by the soldiers, and to be followed, wherever he should lead, against the foe.

But to return from this digression, which is in part history, and in part hypothetical. We have said that Mr. Clay's first onset, in his speech on the new Army Bill, was on the domestic foe. His rebukes were hurled right and left on those who opposed the war, and who thus weakened the arms of the country when the greatest vigor was required. The country was at war with one of the most powerful nations of the earth, and there was no retreat with honor. It was also a war justly provoked by an ac-

* Private Correspondence, page 22.

cumulation of intolerable grievances, aggravated by time and circumstance. Its early stages had been signalized by mortifying failures in the movements of our armies. It was time now to raise new forces, and stir up the giant strength of the nation. Our little navy had done well, and it was only for the army, strengthened by adequate numbers, to regain its lost reputation by new and vigorous campaigns. On the doings of this, the 12th Congress, now drawing to a close, depended, in a great measure, the honor and fate of the nation. It must provide money, an army, and a navy, and put the whole machinery of war in a formidable and effective array. This mighty task rested very much on the shoulders of Mr. Clay. Coadjutors he had in the President, in the Cabinet, in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives; but he was the soul of this great enterprise. He had brought the nation into it, and he was forced to carry the nation through it, nor did he relax from beginning to end.

It is not our business here to give a history of the war, but to show the position which Mr. Clay occupied in its inception, in its progress, and in its winding up. Our growing navy, launched on the sea and on the Lakes, began to signalize itself with victory after victory, and our armies began to feel their strength, and to win fresh laurels, as in the repulse from Baltimore, in compelling the retreat from Plattsburg, and in the hard-fought action on the Niagara frontier, until the battle of New Orleans, on the 8th of January, 1815, drove back the foe, and finished the war; for peace was already concluded by our Commissioners at Ghent.

And here, again, we find Mr. Clay, not less necessary to the nation in making an honorable pacification, than in conducting it through the struggles of war. He resigned his seat in Congress, and took letters to join the American Commissioners at Gottenburg, who afterward adjourned to Ghent, to meet Commissioners from the Government of Great Britain, with a view to enter into negotiations for peace, which were concluded on the 2d of December, 1814. Without derogation from the aid of his older and distinguished colleagues, it was as natural for Mr. Clay to have a paramount influence there, as in all other relations which he ever sustained. Christopher Hughes, Secretary to the American Commissioners at Ghent, was a very partial friend of Mr. Clay, and when writing to him on a subject which drew

forth all the feelings of his heart, he doubtless spoke what he felt to be true: "You did more at that Congress than any other of its members, by your tact, your discretion, your moderation, your angelic self-command, and your incomparable manner; and I will bear this witness before the world—you did more than any other to bestow this most blessed of boons, this God-like gift—peace among men."* Strong testimony this, but sincere—proceeding from the heart, and from the convictions of actual observation. For who should know better? Mr. Hughes was always at the table, performing his duties as secretary.

Mr. Clay, then, made the war—we speak of influence—conducted the war—here, also, we speak of influence—and he was chief in the making of peace. It was a great responsibility, and a glorious result—a responsibility the weight of which he never ceased to feel while he lived—of which we have spoken before. Hence his dread of war, foreign or domestic, and his sleepless vigilance, to arrest and ward off all causes of war. He that was most bellicose, with the insults and injuries inflicted on the American people by Great Britain in his eye, those insults and injuries being avenged, and peace established, put on the meekness of Moses, and, like Moses, gave himself to legislation for the good of the people. The same spirit was in him as before, but it was chastened by Providence. He knew by experience the cost and hazards of war, and if it could be honorably prevented, he would never risk it. He justly acquired the reputation of the GREAT PACIFICATOR.

At a dinner given to Mr. Clay, at Lexington, October 7, 1815, on his return from Ghent, the first toast given was: "Our able negotiators at Ghent. Their talents at diplomacy have kept pace with the valor of our arms, in demonstrating to the enemy, that these States will be free;" to which Mr. Clay replied, in generously dividing the praise equally among all his colleagues for the glorious result announced in the toast; and he went on to state some of the difficulties of the mission. The British Government had declined negotiation before the last campaign, and the first terms proposed by the British Commissioners at Ghent were utterly inadmissable, among which was a claim for the exclusive military control of the Lakes. Our Commissioners drove them from one objectionable point to another, till the terms of peace, as specified in the treaty, were finally adjusted. "The

* Private Correspondence, page 505.

effects of the war," said Mr. Clay, "are highly satisfactory. Abroad our character, which, at the time of the declaration of the war, was in the lowest state of degradation, is raised to the highest point of elevation. * * * At home a Government which, at its formation, was apprehended by its best friends, and pronounced by its enemies, to be incapable of standing such a shock, is found to answer all the purposes of its institution;" and Mr. Clay went on to depict the future of the country in a manner that has since been fully realized.

But the next toast was to Mr. Clay alone: "Our guest, HENRY CLAY. We welcome his return to that country, whose rights and interests he has so ably maintained at home and abroad."

Mr. Clay was touched with the manner in which the toast was received, and said, "his reception had been more like that of a brother, than of a common friend or acquaintance.

In the inception of the war, through the war, and in the peace, Mr. Clay was the prominent man of the Republic.

Mr. Clay was re-elected to the 14th Congress, and made Speaker. One of the first most important measures that came under debate was the recommendation of President Madison for the incorporation of a national bank. Mr. J. C. Calhoun was chairman of the appropriate committee, and reported a bill for that object, which Mr. Clay advocated. The bill passed the House by a vote of eighty to seventy-one, and the Senate by a vote of twenty-two to twelve—was approved in April, 1816, and the second bank of the United States went into operation in 1817, under a charter for twenty years. It will be remembered that the renewal of the charter of the old bank, incorporated in 1791, failed in 1811, and that Mr. Clay made a speech in the Senate in opposition to it.

The commercial and financial condition of the country had very much changed since 1811. The war of 1812 had put the banking system, under the States, to the severest tests, forced them into suspension, and left the country without a reliable currency. The necessities of the country impelled a reconsideration of the knotty Constitutional question, which had been one of the principal reasons, though not the sole one, for deciding against the re-charter of the old bank. The State banks, at that time, were in a healthy condition, and it was thought that they would not only answer all the commercial purposes of the people, but the financial necessities of the Government. But both these ob-

jects proved an utter failure, and nothing could exceed the public and private distress which the suspension of the State banks brought upon the country. In view of these facts, nearly all, President, Cabinet, and statesmen who had refused the re-charter of the United States bank, in 1811, wheeled round, and advocated the re-establishment of a national bank in 1816, and it was done. Mr. Clay was among the number of those who thus changed ground.

On Mr. Clay's return from Congress, after the bank had been chartered, he delivered an address to his constituents at Lexington, June 3, 1816, in vindication of his course. He said: "When he was a member of the Senate of the United States, he was induced to oppose the renewal of the charter of the old bank by three general considerations. The first was, that he was instructed to oppose it by the Legislature of the State. The next was, that he believed the corporation had, during a portion of the period of its existence, abused its powers, and sought to subserve the views of a political party. And the third was, that the power to create a corporation, such as was proposed to be continued, was not specifically granted in the Constitution."

The first of these objections no longer existed, as the State of Kentucky had also wheeled round, and was in favor of a national bank. As to the second, besides the check to the abuse of power, which would naturally arise in the competition of State banks, restored to a healthy condition, the provisions of the new law, he thought, were well devised to prevent such a result. And as to the third, the real knotty point, which could not be so easily disposed of as the first two, the argument is fully stated elsewhere,* the sum of which is, that Mr. Clay in 1816, beat Mr. Clay as he was in 1811. Nor does this prove inconsistency, or that the argument was not sound in both cases, in view of the facts of both cases; for the state of things in the country had entirely changed from 1811 to 1816, so as clearly to justify the application of the specified powers of the Constitution to the creation of a national bank at the latter period, when the question was not so clear at the former. The conditions which made it clear had fully transpired in the latter case; and the argument was equally conclusive as that a thing may be done after a statute of limitation has expired, which could not be done before—not, however, that our illustration is

* Life and Times of Henry Clay, Vol. II., Chapter I.

precisely similar to the case illustrated, since the one is absolute and needs no argument, and the other contingent and therefore always susceptible of argument. But all the contingencies as to the constitutionality of a national bank, so far as they had ever existed, were entirely relieved in 1816. In 1811, an honest argument might have been made on both sides, and we believe Mr. Clay was honest. But with the light of events, in 1816, that same honesty forced him into the position which he then occupied. He confessed a change of ground, but there was no inconsistency. Thus stands the matter of the only change of opinion in Mr. Clay on a great public question, from the beginning to the end of his public career; and considering the premises from which he reasoned, he was right in both cases. It was, in reality, not a change of opinion, but a conclusion arrived at by a change in the condition of the country; and it is a misnomer to call it by the former name. It is fair, therefore, to say that Mr. Clay never changed his opinion on a great public question.

We pass to another pregnant item of Mr. Clay's eventful history, as exhibited in his advocacy of the South American States, including Mexico, while in a state of colonial subjection, and struggling for freedom and independence.

The merit of Mr. Clay in this endeavor, is not to be measured by a consideration of the failure of the South American States to do as well as he hoped they would; nor is his fame at all lessened by that rule. Mr. Clay himself was born and cradled in the American Revolution; he imbibed the spirit of American freedom as soon as he was capable of drinking it in; he left Virginia with his heart full of it; and his position in Kentucky was in all respects calculated to increase its ardor. He made Kentucky, and Kentucky made him. The influence between these two parties, the one on the other, were reciprocal throughout Mr. Clay's public career, more especially in the former part of it. As he fired up in love of freedom, the State fired up, and the State reflected back on him the flame which he had kindled. There was no time in the early part of Mr. Clay's career, when these reciprocal influences were not in vigorous and lively action. They never cooled off, but only grew more fervid.

And then, again, that admirable constitution of the American Confederacy, which transfers the patriotic virtue that grows up in the heart of any one State, to the heart of the Union, to grow and thrive in the concentrated fires of a national feeling, was

cumulative in its effects on the heart of Mr. Clay, as he found himself, by the partiality of his adopted State, a member of the national Legislature, installed in the highest pinnacle of observation and influence. Never ungrateful for, and never forgetting his relations to Kentucky, he now found himself sustaining most important and interesting relations to a wider sphere. He now looked down on the whole family of States with the same feeling which was born and nourished in one of them, intensified in proportion as the field was greater, and as the objects were more magnificent. There was never a time to rest, never a season for the abatement of this patriotic ardor; but all events, as one succeeded to the other, contributed to fan the flame. He could not return to his adopted State without being greeted, nor to the capital of the nation without being welcomed. All things raised him to a higher and more influential position, and as he became known to the wide country, the nation adopted him as the State of Kentucky had done. Here again the influences were reciprocal: he acted on the nation, and the nation acted on him; as he ennobled the American people in the eyes of the world, the American people ennobled him; and the fervors of his patriotism grew in proportion.

Then came the war of 1812, only to augment the importance of his position, and to intensify his feelings of devotion to the cause of freedom. We have seen how he regarded that war—with what a lofty bearing he helped to carry the nation through it, and to bring the nation out of it; and then to apply his great abilities to re-establish the public affairs of the country on a permanent platform of peace.

After such a school of training, never tiring, never abating a whit of his devotion to the interests of his own State and of the nation—now a national man—nay more, a man for all nations, so far as it was proper for him to cherish such a comprehensive philanthropy, and so far as it could be done, without neglecting the duties which he owed to his own country; it was in such a position and in such circumstances, that Mr. Clay opened his eyes on the South American States, struggling for emancipation, as did our forefathers, when they struck for independence of the British crown. It was not for Mr. Clay to *calculate*, but to *sympathize*. From the nature of his history, and from the nature of the man, his whole moral being was only fitted to look on this spectacle with the most intense concern. Sagacity he

had; and besides that which was natural to him, he had the well-earned sagacity of a statesman. These rebellious provinces had taken an irretrievable step, and henceforth, with them, it was freedom or slavery; and with their leaders and captains, it was victory or a halter. They were all a part of America, too, and they had only followed our example. They must have been influenced, and very likely were decided by it. What a glorious prospect, that this American continent should all be emancipated from European despotism, and constitute one great family of free and independent States!

Such, doubtless, was the vision of Mr. Clay, when, in 1817, self-moved and alone, he brought forward the proposal, in the American Congress, that our Government should recognize the independence of the South American States, which were then in a revolutionary struggle against their mother-country, as our fathers were when France came to our aid, and without whose aid, the colonies, most likely, would have been reduced to subjection. Mr. Clay did not consult: he was moved by sympathy; and his first effort, though unsuccessful, made a deep impression on Congress, on the country, and especially on the people of South America, whose leaders caused his speeches to be translated, and read in presence of their armies. The name of Henry Clay, as the advocate of South American freedom, in the Congress of North America, was not only eulogized by the public organs of the South American States, but celebrated in song, in popular ballads, and was as familiarly known among the people of those States as in the United States,* and public monuments were erected to his honor.

These efforts of Mr. Clay for the recognition of the independence of the South American States, were continued from session to session of Congress, gradually subduing opposition, and gaining public favor at home and abroad, till, on the 8th of March, 1822, the President transmitted a message to the House of Rep-

* The following is an extract from a letter addressed to Mr. Clay, dated at Boston, May 19, 1828: "Many years ago, in the House of Representatives, I heard you urge, in terms as bold as eloquent, the necessity of the United States acknowledging the independence of the South American Republics, and it fell to my lot, after such acknowledgment, to hear you spoken of with enthusiasm, from Valdivia to Tumbez, and in more than one instance, to listen to a Castilian strain, in which the North American advocate of the rights of the Southern hemisphere was classed with the Balcaces, the Rondeaus, and the O'Higginses.

"T. H. BENNETT."

resentatives, recommending that the measure of recognition be adopted; and the vote, when taken, the 28th of the same month, showed but *one dissenting voice!* The Supreme Congress of Mexico voted Mr. Clay the thanks of the nation for his great and successful exertions in their behalf. It was a work of years, but a triumphant result at last. Mr. Clay began it alone, against a vigorous opposition; but in the end, carried the nation and the Government with him, by a general acclamation. It was one of the great achievements of his life, and will do him immortal honor.

Mr. Clay's advocacy of Internal Improvements commenced in the early part of his Congressional career, and continued to the end of his public life. The Cumberland Road is a permanent monument of those patriotic endeavors. That he did not foresee how far enterprises of this specific class would be superseded by railways, was because no man could foretell the achievements which science and art have made in a single generation. The original conceptions of Mr. Clay to run public highways over the length and breadth of the Union, as a political bond as well as a commercial facility, and as a means of a quick and rapid social intercourse, have only been realized in a different form. Steam, science, and art, have outstripped the divinations of the most prophetic. Mr. Clay himself, who had once toiled a whole day in traveling nine miles, from Uniontown, Pennsylvania, to the top of Laurel Hill, never dreamed of passing, with almost lightning speed, between Ashland and the city of Washington, in a chair as easy as one in his own parlor; and yet he lived to enjoy this luxury. But his vast and comprehensive policy embraced nothing less, though at a slower rate of movement. He would cover the land with a network of firm and well-built roads, he would improve our rivers and harbors, to remove obstructions from the former, and to make the latter safe and easy of access and exit. He often, and to the last, as we have seen, encountered opposition, in the highest and most influential quarters; but with unflagging purpose and endeavor, he gained little by little, time after time, and in the whole amount, achieved much in this track of a favorite (to him so) public policy; and he succeeded in making it a favorite policy of the nation, so far as popular approbation is concerned. He began his public life in the advocacy of Internal Improvements, and his last great effort in the Senate, at the close of the

Thirty-first Congress, was made in this cause. This subject constitutes one of the most prominent points in Mr. Clay's history, and will forever redound to his honor.

African colonization, though it has never yet obtained that public regard to which its merits justly entitle it, engaged the attention and interested the heart of Mr. Clay to a very great extent. Through evil, as well as through good report, he stood by the American Colonization Society, was its president for a number of years, and advocated its interests to the last. This enterprise presented to his mind two strong, interesting, and attractive features, one of philanthropy, and the other of public policy. He foresaw that, at a time more or less remote, the country would need a safety-valve for its black population; and we see that policy distinctly portrayed in his letter on emancipation to Richard Pindell, Esq., in the Appendix.*

Mr. Clay hoped that colonization would rid the country of slavery. He said in a speech before the Colonization Society of Kentucky, in 1829: "If I could be the instrument in eradicating this deep stain upon the character of our country, and removing all cause of reproach on account of it, by foreign nations; if I could only be instrumental in ridding of this foul blot that revered State that gave me birth, or that not less beloved State which kindly adopted me as her son, I would not exchange the proud satisfaction which I should enjoy for the honor of all the triumphs ever decreed to the most successful conquerors." And his proposed scheme of gradual emancipation for the State of Kentucky, is evidently nothing less than another form of expressing the same wish.

Mr. Clay's views of a tariff for protection of American arts, industry, and labor, constitute a subject worthy of a special notice, in a résumé of his life and character. His first effort in Congress, in this cause, was made in the Senate, April 6, 1810; but they began to be more fully developed soon after the war of 1812 came to a close, when it was sought to get rid of direct taxes by a revenue from imposts. With a wise statesman, to kill two birds with one stone, is no less a maxim than with private individuals. If imposts must be laid for a competent public revenue, why not lay them so as to protect American arts and labor against foreign competition? As European labor was and is so much lower in price than what the American laborer has a

* Note B, p. 346.

right to expect, or will hope for; and as all labor, in the same field of competition, unprotected, must necessarily come to the same level in price, as water, unobstructed, flows to a vacant cistern till it is on a level with the source from whence it comes; so the products of European labor, unimpeded by imposts, will flow in on the field of American labor, till the latter is reduced to the same price with the former. This result is inevitable, on the condition specified; and the principles of the science of political economy have decided that the duties paid for the protection of a domestic product, are a tax on the foreign producer, and not on the domestic consumer, so long as the foreign product is prepared for market by cheaper labor than the domestic product of the same kind. It is only on this principle that importations, subject to protective duties, can be continued; so that all the clamor about consumers being taxed for the amount of duty, when it is a duty for protection, is without foundation.

We do not think that Mr. Clay apprehended the operation of this principle of political science, as he did not, so far as we have observed, avail himself of it. It would have been an unanswerable argument against the opponents of the protective policy, with whom he had so much to do. But Mr. Clay had all the ground of facts which the operation of this principle produced, which he always wielded with irresistible power. It was easy enough to construct an argument out of such materials, which ought to convince all reasonable minds, though as a demonstration it was always incomplete, till science developed the fundamental and controlling principle. The facts all could see; but the reason was occult, till science revealed it. The statement of the science is a very simple one, to wit, that protective duties are never a tax to the consumer, so long as the foreign producer can afford to come into the same market. Prohibitory duties may be a tax to the consumer, though they are not always and necessarily so, as a great and wide competition in the domestic product may prevent it, and reduce the price below what the foreign producer, if he had the market, could or would ever sell for. This, then, is the rule of political science: that, so long as the foreign producer can afford to come into the market, protective duties are never a tax on consumers; but the foreign producer pays the tax for the privilege of vending his wares. True, it is paid indirectly but that makes no difference as to who pays it.

The first protective Tariff was adopted in 1816. The bill was brought in by Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina, and advocated by Mr. Calhoun. Mr. Clay came to its support most heartily, and bent his efforts very especially on the protection of woolen fabrics. This Tariff proved altogether inadequate for protection, and in 1820 another attempt was made in a new bill, to remedy the defects of the law of 1816, which passed the House of Representatives, but failed in the Senate. On this occasion Mr. Clay made one of his most effective speeches on the protective policy, April 26th. In 1824 the commercial embarrassments of the country had been such, that Congress promptly came to the rescue in enacting the Tariff of that year, of which Mr. Clay said, eight years afterward, in the Senate: "If I were to select any term of seven years since the adoption of the present Constitution, which exhibited a scene of the most widespread dismay and desolation, it would be exactly that term of seven years which immediately preceded the establishment of the Tariff of 1824; and if the term of seven years were to be selected, of the greatest prosperity which this people have enjoyed since the adoption of the present Constitution, it would be exactly that seven years which immediately followed the passage of the Tariff of 1824." It was in the debate on this Tariff, that Mr. Clay made one of his masterly efforts, occupying two days, March 30 and 31, 1824; and it was on this occasion that he advocated the adoption of an AMERICAN SYSTEM. From that time, it has borne that name, with the distinctive and peculiar significancy, which Mr. Clay then attached to it—THE AMERICAN SYSTEM.

The Missouri Compromise of 1821, was the first brilliant affair of the kind, in which Mr. Clay was engaged.* Having had occasion elsewhere to depict this event in its appropriate coloring, we shall not enlarge upon it here. It was an epoch inaugurating an extraordinary species of legislation, to avert evils which could find no remedy in the direct and ordinary operation of the Constitution and laws of the country. It was left for the genius of Mr. Clay to devise a remedy for this particular crisis, and to introduce a system of remedies for other crises of a similar character. A direct operation of the Constitution and laws would have produced a convulsion throughout the whole Union; and there was

* See his own account of it in the Appendix, page 334 and onward; and the law itself, page 337.

no other man at that time in the nation, who could see how this could be avoided.

It was the necessity of the hour which suggested the way to the mind of Mr. Clay. The Constitution must not be violated, and this difficulty must be surmounted. Let the Constitution lie in abeyance, till a proposal from Congress to Missouri can be considered; wait a little; forbear; and then, peradventure, the Constitution may go on its way rejoicing. And so it did. Such was the Missouri Compromise of 1821, and such the result. When the crisis had passed, so smoothly, one would have supposed, in view of the calm, that no difficulty had ever occurred. And yet there was a difficulty which filled the land with disquiet, and timid minds with dismay.

The feud between Mr. Clay and General Jackson, which had such important results, originated in strictures made by Mr. Clay in Congress, in a speech delivered January 17, 1819, on the General's conduct of the Seminole war. General Jackson had been severe in his treatment of the Indians that fell into his hands, punished two chiefs with death, hung two traders, Arbuthnot and Ambrester, who were British subjects, pushed his march into the Spanish territories of Florida, took possession of St. Marks, Pensacola, and the Barancas, when Spain and the United States were at peace. In view of these high-handed measures, resolutions of censure were moved in the House of Representatives, and Mr. Clay supported them. Mr. Clay thought badly of this conduct, and all knew that he could only be honest in dealing with it. It was natural that General Jackson should writhe under such rebuke, as he doubtless did; nor was it very natural that he should ever forget it, as he certainly did not. Nothwithstanding, when General Jackson came to Washington, Mr. Clay left his card for him at his lodgings; but General Jackson made no response to it. It was not in the nature of Mr. Clay to cherish personal enmity.

In this case, he had none to begin with. There is no conceivable motive for his censure of General Jackson's conduct, but that of public justice—to throw off the responsibility of those transactions from the shoulders of the American Government, on the individual who had so manifestly transcended his instructions, while acting in the name and on the authority of the Government, and who had violated the rules of civilized warfare. The President [Mr. Monroe] and his Cabinet were somehow committed

to defend General Jackson, and their influence was sufficient to defeat the resolutions of censure in the House of Representatives.

How far General Jackson thought on revenge for the speech of Mr. Clay, it would not be suitable even to conjecture. It was thought and believed by Mr. Clay and his friends, and there can be no doubt, that he was at the foundation of the charge of "Bargain and Corruption" brought against Mr. Clay, when he voted for Mr. Adams for President, and accepted the Department of State. One thing is certain, whether General Jackson was himself the author of the charge or not, he cherished and entertained it with a tenacity that was never willing to part with it. To make it believed, would make him President. Among the ignorant and credulous, who delight in slander, and who trade in it—especially if the mark be a lofty one—it was believed, and General Jackson and his friends and followers made the most of it. They soon found what a pregnant political capital it was. General Jackson had won a well-merited fame at the battle of New Orleans, and he received the highest vote in the Electoral Colleges—99 to 84 for Mr. Adams, and 41 for Mr. Crawford—and the appeal addressed to the people of the United States was, that, for this reason, General Jackson was best entitled to the Presidency, notwithstanding that Mr. Adams's popular vote was greater than General Jackson's, which, really, was the fair rule of reckoning in an argumeut of this kind. But it was charged that Mr. Clay had sold himself to Mr. Adams for office! And the charge was confirmed in the popular belief, by the fact, that Mr. Clay actually accepted the office. General Jackson, it was said, had been defrauded of his rights by a bargain between Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay; and in the circumstances of the case, it proved to be the best political capital that ever fell to the lot of any man, or of any party. To this false accusation—proved to be false, and known to be false by those who uttered it—General Jackson owed all his popularity, and his election twice as President of the United States. It can not be denied that, for such an object, the temptation to so stupendous a fraud was a strong one, and the reward was only commensurate with the wrong.

It was not in the power even of such a conspiracy to destroy Mr. Clay. It only barred him from a position in which he could have done the greatest service to his country. Apart from the

influences of this infamous plot, no man, and no fair political contest, could have stood in the way of Mr. Clay's immense popularity. Apart from this, not even the military éclât of General Jackson would have availed him. It was by appealing to the ignorant masses, who could more easily be deceived, that a great party was formed, strong in numbers, to avenge the alleged wrongs of a military chieftain, and carry him into power on their shoulders. It was introducing a new and pernicious principle into the body politic, by arraying the poor against the rich, the less informed against the better informed, and bringing a dark cloud over all the more hopeful aspects of our social and political institutions. It was an epoch of a melancholy augury, opening a new era in the politics of the country, the fundamental maxim of which is, By any means, false or foul, obtain the control of the masses in the lower strata of society. So long as Mr. Clay lived, though he could never gain his own rightful position, so well earned by his patriotism and public services, he was the leader of a party that struggled hard to overcome these malign influences, and more than once partially triumphed; but by deserting their leader, they became disorganized, and lost their power. Mr. Clay is gone; and whether the hopes of the country have died with him, is the problem of the future. The grand obstacle to his more useful career, was the GREAT CONSPIRACY* formed against him in 1825.

Mr. Clay's own opinion of General Jackson's responsibility in the charge of "Bargain," was expressed, in a dignified manner, at the dinner given him at Washington, on his retirement from the State Department, as follows: "That citizen [General Jackson] has done me great injustice. It was inflicted, as I must ever believe, for the double purpose of gratifying private resentment, and promoting personal ambition. When, during the late canvass, he came forward in the public prints under his proper name, with his charge against me, and summoned before the public tribunal his friend and only witness (Mr. Buchanan) to establish it, the anxious attention of the whole American people was directed to the testimony which that witness might render. He promptly obeyed the call, and testified to what he knew. He *could* say nothing, and he *said nothing* which cast the slightest shade upon my honor or integrity. What he *did* say was the

* For a full account of this conspiracy, see Vol. I. of Life and Times, Chapters 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th.

reverse of any implication of *me.* Then all just and impartial men, and all who had faith in the magnanimity of my accuser, believed that he would make a public acknowledgment of his error. How far this reasonable expectation has been realized, *let his persevering and stubborn silence attest.*"

The reputation earned by Mr. Clay in the State Department constitutes a distinct and brilliant chapter of his life. His statesmanlike conceptions of the foreign relations of the country, procured for him the unlimited confidence of the President, Mr. Adams, whose executive supervision of this department was almost merely nominal. Mr. Adams knew that our foreign affairs could not be in better hands. Mr. Clay induced the Czar of Russia to intercede with Spain for the recognition of South American Independence, and thus crowned his previous efforts in Congress, in behalf of the South American States, with a final consummation. He moved Russia and other European States to favor the Greek revolution, and held in check those who were opposed to it, till the independence of Greece was also recognized. First, by his voice in Congress, and next, by his administration of the State Department, he secured freedom to South America and freedom to Greece. His Letter of Instructions to our representatives in the Panama Congress, is one of the ablest State papers that ever emanated from the Department over which he presided.

Mr. Clay had been trained in a school which eminently fitted him for this place ; and besides the advantages of his experience, his inventive genius, which never failed him, and rarely, if ever, led him into error, was always available for all exigences. He graced the station by his personal accomplishments, dignified it by his manly bearing, and raised the Government of the United States by the able and energetic discharge of his official duties, to increased respect among all foreign nations.

It was not, therefore, very auspicious to the prospects of the Republic, when Mr. Clay, in the spring of 1829, returning to Ashland, on entering Uniontown, Pa., sitting on the box outside with the driver, to escape the discomfort of having his head knocked against the top of the stage inside, in consequence of bad roads, said to his friends, as they drove up to the hotel : "You see, I am one of the OUTS ; but I can assure you the INS behind me have the worst of it."

We have elsewhere had occasion to notice the testimony of

John Quincy Adams to the ability and fidelity of Mr. Clay, in the discharge of his duties as Secretary of State, as well as his solemn appeal to Heaven in denial of the charge of "Bargain" between himself and Mr. Clay.*

It was during Mr. Clay's occupancy of the State Department, in 1826, that the duel between him and Mr. Randolph occurred. In a letter from General Jesup to James B. Clay, given in the Private Correspondence,† will be found some interesting details of this affair. The relations of Mr. Clay to Mr. Randolph, in this and other matters, are also presented in our second volume, to which the reader is referred.‡ Mr. Clay also refers to the subject in several of his letters in the Private Correspondence. To these we now add another letter from Mr. Clay on dueling, written in 1844, which will be found in the Appendix.§ It will be seen, that, although he was more than once engaged in an affair of this kind,‖ he never approved, but always condemned the practice. Better if he had obeyed his own precepts. But he did not then profess to be under the higher obligations of Christian principle.

Mr. Clay remained in retirement two years, after he left the State Department, and was elected to the Senate of the United States in 1831. He had no responsibility in the enactment of the "Black Tariff" of 1828, as he was then Secretary of State. It became a law in spite of those obnoxious features thrust into

* Life and Times, Vol. I., p. 391. The following anecdote, which first appeared in the Newark (N. J.) *Daily Advertiser*, from the pen of a Washington correspondent, will be deemed worthy of record: "I have frequently observed ladies' albums circulating through the House and Senate Chamber, with the view of collecting the autographs of members. One this morning, belonging to a young lady of ——, attracted considerable attention. Upon examination, I found it contained a page of well-written poetry, dated 23d July, 1842, in the tremulous hand-writing of John Q. Adams. This piece was descriptive of the wild chaos at present spread over our political affairs, and anticipated coming events which would bring order out of disorder. The closing verse was as follows:

"'Say, for whose brow this laurel crown?
For whom this web of life is spinning?
Turn this, thy album, upside down,
And take the end for the beginning.'

The meaning of this was somewhat mystical. But by turning to the back of the book, and inverting it, on its last page a piece was found written with the signature of H. Clay."

† Page 146.

‡ Life and Times, Vol. II., p. 261, and onward.

§ Note G, page 451.

‖ His first duel was with Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky.

it by the opponents of the protective policy, for the purpose of defeating the bill. It became necessary, therefore, to remodel the Tariff in the 22d Congress, which, notwithstanding the abatement of the obnoxious parts of that of 1828, was unsatisfactory. The South, which at first joined in the policy of protection, and assisted in establishing it, had become violently opposed to it; and it was during the 22d Congress that the dissatisfaction of South Carolina ripened into Nullification, and the authorities of that State came in conflict with those of the Federal Government, while General Jackson was President of the United States, and in his second term. General Jackson issued his proclamation, declaring the action of the State of South Carolina treason, and that he would subdue it by force, if necessary. Governor Hayne issued a counter-proclamation, calling on the people and the authorities of the State for obedience. Thus, in 1833, stood the affairs of the nation, the General government pitted against a State government, and both preparing for the conflict.

General Jackson, in his impetuosity, and in his extreme dislike of Mr. Calhoun, between whom and himself had arisen a personal feud, had gone too far, or too fast, or perhaps both. But he was not the man to tread back. How should he get out of this difficulty? He also hated Mr. Clay, and Mr. Clay was regarded as the father of the protective policy which General Jackson himself had once declared for. If, therefore, he could put forward his own party in Congress, to bring in and pass a bill to kill off the protective policy, he would at the same time make peace with South Carolina, and kill off Mr. Clay. It was a grand device that should kill two such birds with one stone, and a bill, having this object, was accordingly soon concocted, and reported to the House of Representatives by Mr. Verplanck, which, in history, is known as Mr. Verplanck's bill.

Mr. Clay, seeing that the protective policy was at stake, instantly put himself to the task of heading off this measure, and brought into the Senate the Compromise Tariff of 1833. Mr. Calhoun was then a member of the Senate, and stood trembling in his shoes, as General Jackson had threatened to hang him as the leader of Nullification. Opposed as Mr. Clay and Mr. Calhoun were, at this time, in their views of national policy, Mr. Calhoun would rather take the olive-branch from the hand of Mr. Clay, than be hung by General Jackson, or than have peace

made with South Carolina by the General, in the way of Mr. Verplanck's bill. Thus human nature, in its most natural developments, favored Mr. Clay's project. Mr. Calhoun was on the spot, and in constant communication with the Governor and authorities of South Carolina. Whatever he should agree to at Washington, as a peace measure, they would sanction; for Mr. Calhoun was himself the leader and soul of Nullification. The whole matter, therefore, was settled on the floor of the Senate chamber, and in the private intercourse in that body of the two parties to this question, casting the other end of the Avenue, at the President's mansion, entirely without the pale of influence. General Jackson, who was supposed, and supposed himself, to have the game in his own hand, lost his trump the moment that Mr. Clay leaped into the arena. The Compromise Tariff of 1833 was framed with the consent of the opposite party, and they agreed to it.

Here is another instance, an eminent example, of the practical character and consummate tact of Mr. Clay in affairs of State, in a great public exigency. It was absolutely necessary to devise a scheme of conciliation which would have no rival, and which would sweep every thing else from the boards; and it must be effective, conclusive, valid. Doubtless Mr. Clay had to sacrifice more in this measure than he could have wished to do. But it was a compromise, and he wished not only to restore harmony to the Union, but to save the principle of protection, even at the risk of being supposed to have given it up, as many at the time said, and many ever since have said, that he did. But he did not. He gave to the measure a nine years' lease, to 1842, by which time he hoped that the reckless Jacksonian policy would spend itself, and the country be able to come back to an adequate protective system. We see in this measure of 1833, not only the great statesman's skill in adapting it to the moment, so that it should answer all its desirable purposes, and restore peace to the country; but we see his prophetic discernment in adapting it to the future. It was precisely nine years when the country was fully prepared for the tariff of 1842, and the principle of protection was never abandoned. When the compromise tariff of 1833 came to be understood, Mr. Clay's popularity rose to a higher point than it had ever reached before —higher, perhaps, than it ever reached afterward. He not only saved the country from being drenched in the blood of a civil

war, but he satisfied all the manufacturing and other interests that needed protection, that he had done the best thing possible for them, in the circumstances of the case. The tour which he afterward made through the Eastern States, was an ovation from beginning to end; and he rested on his laurels.

Mr. Clay was, of course, a candidate for the Presidency—a position which, for the half of his public life, he could not vacate, if he would—when he brought in his famous land bill, at the first session of the 22d Congress. His political opponents expected that in that measure, he would bid for votes in the new States of the rising West. Who ever knew Mr. Clay to swerve from his conscientious convictions of right? He saw that now was the time, or never, to do justice to the old States, in the distribution of the public lands, as they had purchased them with their blood. He foresaw that the new States, within whose limits so large a portion of the public domain lay, would soon say, "These are our lands." To the utter amazement of the opposite party, Mr. Clay brought in a bill that was strictly just to all the States, without any regard to its effect on his popularity in the West. It was debated, and passed the Senate, but was postponed in the House to the next session, when it passed the Senate by a vote of twenty-four to twenty, and the House by ninety-six to forty. Unfortunately, when the bill was sent to the President (General Jackson), there were not so many days left in the session as he had a right to keep it for consideration, and having resolved to veto it, he put it in his pocket, and returned it with his objections at the beginning of the first session of the next Congress—a stretch of power which none but General Jackson might presume upon. He knew that if he had returned it to the Congress which sent it to him, it would have been passed by a two thirds vote; and he should have known that he might, with as much propriety, have returned it to the Parliament of Great Britain as to the 23d Congress, as neither was the body that passed the bill. This unconstitutional act was fair game for Mr. Clay, and he used it with tremendous effect. It was not till the Whig party had obtained power, in the elections of 1840, that Mr. Clay was enabled, in the 27th Congress, to carry his policy for the distribution of the public lands into effect.

There was a great contest in the second term of General Jackson's occupancy of the executive chair regarding the bank of the United States, with the President on one side and Mr. Clay on

the other; and the President triumphed, so far at least as to have his own way. The bank fell; the public deposits were withdrawn in a very questionable manner; it was incorporated by the State of Pennsylvania; and Nicholas Biddle, the president of the bank, undertook to fight Andrew Jackson, the President of the United States, in which conflict the former fell, and the bank fell, to rise no more. To this day the United States bank of Pennsylvania is regarded, by a majority of the people of the United States, as identical with the bank of the United States that was a national institution—all by the influence of party. The former bank, by the perversion of its faculties, in a personal feud, came to nothing, and ruined thousands; whereas, no man ever lost a penny by the latter, and it was the best regulator of the national currency we have ever had, besides that it transacted all the monetary affairs of the Government without charge.

The Sub or Independent Treasury, which was brought into being under Mr. Van Buren's administration, repealed under Mr. Tyler's, re-established under Mr. Polk's, and which is now (1856) the law of the land for all the banking functions of the Government, was vigorously opposed by Mr. Clay, and he was a leader in its repeal in the Twenty-seventh Congress. Mr. Clay's speeches on the Sub-Treasury, are among his most argumentative and most eloquent discourses.

In 1834–'35, the subject of French spoliations came before Congress, in consequence of the failure of the French Government —the Government of Louis Philippe—to pay the first installment due to our Government by a treaty made with France in 1831, as part of an indemnity. President Jackson, with great precipitancy, sent a message to Congress, recommending a measure of reprisals on French commerce, if the payment should not be made during the next session of the French Chambers. The carrying out of such a measure would, of course, have involved us in inevitable war with France. The inflammable temper of the French nation was not likely to regard such a proposal in any other light than an insult. But the matter was on the wing, and how should the difficulty be surmounted? All eyes were turned to Mr. Clay, whom the Senate had placed at the head of the Committee on Foreign affairs. Mr. Clay set himself to the task, and made an elaborate, but conciliatory report, at the same time asserting our rights in the premises, concluding by recommending the following resolution: "That it is inexpedient

to pass, at this time, any law vesting in the President authority for making reprisals upon French property, in the contingency of provision not being made for paying to the United States the indemnity stipulated by the treaty of 1831, during the present session of the French Chambers." It is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of either House of Congress, that this resolution should have passed *without a dissenting voice*—all through the influence of Mr. Clay in the argument of his report and his speech on the occasion! The news of this decision followed that of General Jackson's recommendation; and notwithstanding the French embassador had been recalled from Washington, and the American minister at Paris had received his passports, as a forerunner of hostilities, the disturbed waters were calmed by the oil poured upon them from the hand of Mr. Clay, the indemnity was paid, and there was peace and quiet again.

Under the administrations of General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren, the prosperity of the country had run down to its lowest ebb, and the whole nation was prepared, in 1840, to return to the principles of Mr. Clay's public policy. Mr. Clay had stood the brunt of the contest, and fought hand to hand with his opponents, for a dozen years. He had saved the nation, in all that he could, from evil, while in the minority, and done all the good he could in such a disadvantageous position. He had vindicated his principles, sown his seed, which had sprung up, and began to bear fruit. The harvest was ripe for his sickle in 1840, and that was the time when the party which acknowledged him as leader, should have made him President of the United States. Mr. Clay had earned it, and the party was under every obligation to confer that honor upon him. But they passed by him, and put forward William H. Harrison and John Tyler, the first of whom died in thirty days after he was inaugurated President, and the second succeeding, disappointed the party, disappointed the nation, disappointed the world; and notwithstanding all the efforts of Mr. Clay and his associates, he being still faithful to his principles and to the party, and still in the Senate of the United States, nothing could stay the consequences of the fatal error of the Harrisburg Convention.

The immense disasters occasioned by the Tyler treason, brought back the party to Mr. Clay in 1844, with compunction and remorse; and the greatest agony that ever shook the nation's heart, went into the Presidential campaign of that year. But the

fatal error had done its work, and given an advatange to his opponents too mighty to be overcome. The hosts which had heretofore mustered under Mr. Clay's lead, had been disorganized; there was no chance to carry out his principles under the Tyler administration, which had been brought into power by his friends, and for which his friends were responsible; and although it was the most gigantic effort which the political annals of the country have ever recorded, it terminated in the sad discomfiture of the party whose repentance for past delinquencies came too late.

In one of the preceding chapters, we have spoken of the fall of the Whig party, and of its cause. It is one of the most instructive pages of history. It was once a party of principle; but when it ceased to be such, it fell. After a long struggle, under Mr. Clay, its principles had triumphed; and if the party had adhered to him, there was every prospect that those principles would have had a permanent sway. But when they deserted him, their disorganization was rapid; and who shall now gather up the fragments?

The remainder of Mr. Clay's life being given in this volume, supersedes the necessity of carrying out this rapid sketch over the same ground which the reader may be supposed just to have trodden. We have endeavored to make a record as well of Mr. Clay's principles as of his eventful history; and we leave it with those who may be disposed, to profit by it.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

Note A.—Page 132.

RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, BY MR. CLAY, JANUARY 29, 1850.

PREAMBLE.—It being desirable for the peace, concord, and harmony of the Union of these States, to settle and adjust amicably all questions of controversy between them arising out of the institution of Slavery, upon a fair equality and just basis, therefore—

1st. *Resolved*, That California, with suitable boundaries, ought, upon her application, to be admitted as one of the States of this Union, without the imposition by Congress of any restriction to the exclusion or introduction of slavery within those boundaries.

2d. *Resolved*, That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide, by law, either for its introduction into, or its exclusion from, any part of the said territory; and that appropriate territorial Governments ought to be established by Congress, in all of the said territory not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the addition of any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery.

3d. *Resolved*, That the western boundary of the State of Texas ought to be fixed on the Rio del Norte, commencing one marine league from its mouth, and running up that river to the southern line of New Mexico, thence with that line eastwardly, and continuing in the same direction, to the line as established between the United States and Spain, excluding any portion of New Mexico, whether lying on the east or west of that river.

4th. *Resolved*, That it be proposed to the State of Texas that the United States will provide for the payment of all that portion of all the legitimate and bonâ fide public debts of that State, contracted prior to its annexation to the United States, and for which the duties on foreign imports were pledged by the said State to its creditors, not exceeding the sum of —— dollars, in consideration of the duties, as pledged, having been no longer

applicable to that object after the said annexation, but having thenceforward become payable to the United States, and upon the condition also that the said State shall, by some solemn and authentic act of her Legislature, or of a convention, relinquish to the United States any claim which it has to any part of New Mexico.

5th. *Resolved*, That it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, while that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of that State, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District.

6th. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to prohibit within the District the trade in slaves brought into it from States or places beyond the limits of the District, either to be sold therein, as merchandise, or to be transported to other markets without the District of Columbia.

7th. *Resolved*, That more effectual provision ought to be made by law according to the requirements of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of persons bound to service or labor, in any State, who may escape into any other State or Territory of this Union.

8th. *Resolved*, That Congress has no power to prohibit or obstruct the trade in slaves between the slaveholding States, and that the admission or exclusion of slaves brought from one into another of them, depends exclusively upon their own particular law.

SPEECH OF MR. CLAY ON THE FOREGOING RESOLUTIONS,

DELIVERED FEBRUARY 5TH AND 6TH, 1850.

Mr. President, never on any former occasion have I risen under feelings of such painful solicitude. I have seen many periods of great anxiety, of peril, and of danger in this country, and I have never before risen to address any assemblage so oppressed, so appalled, and so anxious; and sir, I hope it will not be out of place to do here, what again and again I have done in my private chamber, to implore of Him who holds the destinies of nations and individuals in His hands, to bestow upon our country His blessing, to calm the violence and rage of party, to still passion, to allow reason once more to resume its empire. And may I not ask of Him too, sir, to bestow on his humble servant, now before him, the blessing of his smiles, and of strength and ability to perform the work which now lies before him? Sir, I have said that I have seen other anxious periods in the history of our country, and if I were to venture, Mr. President, to trace to their original source the cause of all our present dangers, difficulties, and distraction, I should ascribe it to the violence and intemperance of party spirit. To party spirit! Sir, in the progress of this session we have had the testimony of two senators here, who, however they may differ on other matters, concur in the existence of that cause in originating the

unhappy differences which prevail throughout the country, on the subject of the institution of slavery.

Parties, in their endeavors to obtain, the one ascendency over the other, catch at every passing or floating plank in order to add strength and power to each. We have been told by the two senators to whom I have referred, that each of the parties at the North, in its turn, has moved and endeavored to obtain the assistance of a small party called Abolitionists, in order that the scale in its favor might preponderate against that of its adversary. And all around us, every where, we see too many evidences of the existence of the spirit and intemperance of party. I might go to other legislative bodies than that which is assembled in Congress, and I might draw from them illustrations of the melancholy truth upon which I am dwelling, but I need not pass out of this Capitol itself. I say it, sir, with all deference and respect to that other portion of Congress assembled in the other wing of this Capitol; but what have we seen there? During this very session one whole week has been exhausted—I think about a week—in the vain endeavor to elect a doorkeeper of the House.

And, Mr. President, what was the question in this struggle to elect a doorkeeper? It was not as to the man or the qualities of the man, or who is best adapted to the situation. It was whether the doorkeeper entertained opinions upon certain national measures coincident with this or that side of the House. That was the sole question which prevented the election of a doorkeeper for about the period of a week. Sir, I make no reproaches—none, to either portion of that House; I state the fact; and I state the fact to draw from it the conclusion and to express the hope that there will be an endeavor to check this violence of party.

Sir, what vicissitudes do we not pass through in this short mortal career of ours? Eight years, or nearly eight years ago, I took my leave finally, and, as I supposed, forever, from this body. At that time I did not conceive of the possibility of ever again returning to it. And if my private wishes and particular inclinations, and the desire during the short remnant of my days to remain in repose and quiet, could have prevailed, you would never have seen me occupying the seat which I now occupy upon this floor. The Legislature of the State to which I belong, unsolicited by me, chose to designate me for this station, and I have come here, sir, in obedience to a sense of stern duty, with no personal objects, no private views, now or hereafter, to gratify. I know, sir, the jealousies, the fears, the apprehensions which are engendered by the existence of that party spirit to which I have referred; but if there be in my hearing now, in or out of this Capitol, any one who hopes, in his race for honors and elevation, for higher honors and higher elevation than that which he now occupies, I beg him to believe that I, at least, will never jostle him in the pursuit of those honors or that elevation. I beg him to be perfectly persuaded that, if my wishes prevail, my name shall never be used in competition with his. I beg to assure him that when my service is terminated in this body, my mission, so far as respects the public affairs of this world and upon this earth, is closed, and closed, if my wishes prevail, forever.

But, sir, it is impossible for us to be blind to the facts which are daily transpiring before us. It is impossible for us not to perceive that party spirit and future elevation mix more or less in all our affairs, in all our deliberations. At a moment when the White House itself is in danger of conflagration, instead of all hands uniting to extinguish the flames, we are contending about who shall be its next occupant. When a dreadful *crevasse* has occurred, which threatens inundation and destruction to all around

it, we are contending and disputing about the profits of an estate which is threatened with total submersion.

Mr. President, it is passion, passion—party, party, and intemperance—that is all I dread in the adjustment of the great questions which unhappily at this time divide our distracted country. Sir, at this moment we have in the legislative bodies of this Capitol and in the States, twenty old furnaces in full blast, emitting heat, and passion, and intemperance, and diffusing them throughout the whole extent of this broad land. Two months ago all was calm in comparison to the present moment. All now is uproar, confusion, and menace to the existence of the Union, and to the happiness and safety of this people. Sir, I implore senators, I entreat them, by all that they expect hereafter, and by all that is dear to them here below, to repress the ardor of these passions, to look to their country, to its interests, to listen to the voice of reason—not as it shall be attempted to be uttered by me, for I am not so presumptuous as to indulge the hope that any thing I may say will avert the effects which I have described, but to listen to their own reason, their own judgment, their own good sense, in determining upon what is best to be done for our country in the actual posture in which we find her. Sir, to this great object have my efforts been directed during the whole session.

I have cut myself off from all the usual enjoyments of social life, I have confined myself almost entirely, with very few exceptions, to my own chamber, and from the beginning of the session to the present time my thoughts have been anxiously directed to the object of finding some plan, of proposing some mode of accommodation, which would once more restore the blessings of concord, harmony and peace to this great country. I am not vain enough to suppose that I have been successful in the accomplishment of this object, but I have presented a scheme, and allow me to say to honorable senators that, if they find in that plan any thing that is defective, if they find in it any thing that is worthy of acceptance, but is susceptible of improvement by amendment, it seems to me that the true and patriotic course is not to denounce it, but to improve it—not to reject without examination any project of accommodation having for its object the restoration of harmony in this country, but to look at it to see if it be susceptible of elaboration or improvement, so as to accomplish the object which I indulge the hope is common to all and every one of us, to restore peace and quiet, and harmony and happiness to this country.

Sir, when I came to consider this subject, there were two or three general purposes which it seemed to me to be most desirable, if possible, to accomplish. The one was, to settle all the controverted questions arising out of the subject of slavery. It seemed to me to be doing very little, if we settled one question and left other distracting questions unadjusted, it seemed to me to be doing but little, if we stopped one leak only in the ship of State, and left other leaks capable of producing danger, if not destruction, to the vessel. I therefore turned my attention to every subject connected with the institution of slavery, and out of which controverted questions had sprung, to see if it were possible or practicable to accommodate and adjust the whole of them. Another principal object which attracted my attention was, to endeavor to form such a scheme of accommodation that neither of the two classes of States into which our country is so unhappily divided should make any sacrifice of any great principle. I believe, sir, the series of resolutions which I have had the honor to present to the Senate accomplishes that object.

Sir, another purpose which I had in view was this: I was aware of the

difference of opinion prevailing between these two classes of States. I was aware that, while one portion of the Union was pushing matters, as it seemed to me, to the greatest extremity, another portion of the Union was pushing them to an opposite, perhaps not less dangerous extremity. It appeared to me, then, that if any arrangement, any satisfactory adjustment could be made of the controverted questions between the two classes of States, that adjustment, that arrangement, could only be successful and effectual by extracting from both parties some concessions—not of principle, not of principle at all, but of feeling, of opinion, in relation to matters in controversy between them. Sir, I believe the resolutions which I have prepared fulfill that object. I believe, sir, that you will find, upon that careful, rational, and attentive examination of them, which I think they deserve, that neither party in some of them make any concession at all; in others the concessions of forbearance are mutual; and in the third place, in reference to the slaveholding States, there are resolutions making concessions to them by the opposite class of States, without any compensation whatever being rendered by them to the non-slaveholding States. I think every one of these characteristics which I have assigned, and the measures which I proposed, is susceptible of clear and satisfactory demonstration by an attentive perusal and critical examination of the resolutions themselves. Let us take up the first resolution.

The first resolution, Mr. President, as you are aware, relates to California, and it declares that California, with suitable limits, ought to be admitted as a member of this Union, without the imposition of any restriction either to interdict or to introduce slavery within her limits. Well now, is there any concession in this resolution by either party to the other? I know that gentlemen who come from slaveholding States say the North gets all that it desires; but by whom does it get it? Does it get it by any action of Congress? If slavery be interdicted within the limits of California, has it been done by Congress—by this Government? No, sir. That interdiction is imposed by California herself. And has it not been the doctrine of all parties that when a State is about to be admitted into the Union, the State has a right to decide for itself whether it will or will not have slavery within its limits?

The great principle, sir, which was in contest upon the memorable occasion of the introduction of Missouri into the Union, was, whether it was competent or not competent for Congress to impose any restriction which should exist after she became a member of the Union. We who were in favor of the admission of Missouri, contended that no such restriction should be imposed. We contended that, whenever she was once admitted into the Union, she had all the rights and privileges of any pre-existing State in the Union, and that among these rights and privileges was one to decide for herself whether slavery should or should not exist within her limits; that she had as much a right to decide upon the introduction of slavery or its abolition as New York had a right to decide upon the introduction or abolition of slavery; and that, although subsequently admitted, she stood among her peers, equally invested with all the privileges that any one of the original thirteen States had a right to enjoy.

Sir, I think that those who have been contending with so much earnestness and perseverance for the Wilmot proviso, ought to reflect that, even if they could carry their object and adopt the proviso, it ceases the moment any State or Territory to which it was applicable came to be admitted as a member of the Union. Why, sir, no one contends now, no one believes, that with regard to those North-western States to which the ordinance of

1787 applied—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan—no one can now believe but that any one of those States, if they thought proper to do it, have just as much right to introduce slavery within their borders, as Virginia has to maintain the existence of slavery within hers. Then, sir, if in the struggle for power and empire between the two classes of States a decision in California has taken place adverse to the wishes of the Southern States, it is a decision not made by the General Government.

It is a decision respecting which they can utter no complaint toward the General Government. It is a decision made by California herself; which California had unquestionably the right to make under the Constitution of the United States. There is, then, in the first resolution, according to the observation which I made some time ago, a case where neither party concedes; where the question of slavery, neither its introduction nor interdiction, is decided in reference to the action of this Government; and if it has been decided, it has been by a different body—by a different power—by California itself, which had a right to make the decision.

Mr. President, the next resolution in the series which I have offered I beg gentlemen candidly now to look at. I was aware, perfectly aware, of the perseverance with which the Wilmot proviso was insisted upon. I knew that every one of the free States in this Union, without exception, had by its Legislative body passed resolutions instructing their Senators and requesting their Representatives to get that restriction incorporated in any Territorial Government which might be established under the auspices of Congress. I knew how much, and I regretted how much, the free States had put their hearts upon the adoption of this measure. In the second resolution I call upon them to waive persisting in it. I ask them, for the sake of peace and in the spirit of mutual forbearance to other members of the Union, to give it up—to no longer insist upon it—to see, as they must see, if their eyes are open, the dangers which lie ahead, if they persevere in insisting upon it.

When I called upon them in this resolution to do this, was I not bound to offer, for a surrender of that favorite principle or measure of theirs, some compensation, not as an equivalent by any means, but some compensation in the spirit of mutual forbearance, which, animating one side, ought at the same time to actuate the other side? Well, sir, what is it that is offered them? It is a declaration of what I characterized, and must still characterize, with great deference to all those who entertain opposite opinions, as two truths, I will not say incontestible, but to me clear, and I think they ought to be regarded as indisputable truths. What are they? The first is, that by law slavery no longer exists in any part of the acquisitions made by us from the Republic of Mexico; and the other is, that in our opinion, according to the probabilities of the case, slavery never will be introduced into any portion of the territories so acquired from Mexico. Now, I have heard it said that this declaration of what I call these two truths is equivalent to the enactment of the Wilmot proviso.

I have heard this asserted, but is that the case? If the Wilmot proviso be adopted in Territorial Governments established over these countries acquired from Mexico, it would be a positive enactment, a prohibition, an interdiction as to the introduction of slavery within them; but with regard to these opinions I had hoped, and I shall still indulge the hope, that those who represent the free States will be inclined not to insist—indeed it would be extremely difficult to give to these declarations the form of positive enactment. I had hoped that they would be satisfied with the simple expression of the opinion of Congress, leaving it upon the basis of that opinion,

without asking for what seems to me almost impracticable, if not impossible —for any subsequent enactment to be introduced into the bill by which Territorial Governments should be established.

And I can only say that the second resolution, even without the declaration of these two truths expressed, would be much more acceptable to me than with them—but I could not forget that I was proposing a scheme of arrangement and compromise, and I could not, therefore, depart from the duty which the preparation of such a scheme seems to me to impose, of offering, while we ask the surrender on one side of a favorite measure, of offering to the other side some compensation for that surrender or sacrifice. What are the truths, Mr. President? The first is, that by law slavery does not exist within the Territories ceded to us by the Republic of Mexico. It is a misfortune, sir, in the various weighty and important topics which are connected with the subject that I am now addressing you upon, that any one of the five or six furnishes a theme for a lengthened speech; and I am therefore reduced to the necessity, I think—at least in this stage of the discussion—of limiting myself rather to the expression of opinions, than going at any great length into the discussion of all these various topics.

With respect to the opinion that slavery does not exist in the Territories ceded to the United States by Mexico, I can only refer to the fact of the passage of the law by the Supreme Government of Mexico abolishing it, I think, in 1824; and to the subsequent passage of a law by the Legislative body of Mexico, I forget in what year, by which they proposed—what it is true they have never yet carried into full effect—compensation to the owners of slaves for the property of which they were stripped by the act of abolition. I can only refer to the acquiescence of Mexico in the abolition of slavery, from the time of its extinction down to the time of the treaty by which we acquired these countries. But all Mexico, so far as I know, acquiesced in the non-existence of slavery. Gentlemen, I know, talk about the irregularity of the law by which that act was accomplished; but does it become us, a foreign power, to look into the mode by which an object has been accomplished by another foreign power, when she herself is satisfied with what she has done; and when, too, she is the exclusive judge whether an object which is local and municipal to herself, has been or has not been accomplished in conformity with her fundamental laws? Why, Mexico upon this subject showed to the last moment, her anxiety in the documents which were laid before the country upon the subject of the negotiation of this treaty, by Mr. Trist.

In the very act, in the very negotiation by which the treaty was concluded, ceding to us the countries in question, the diplomatic representatives of the Mexican Republic urged the abhorrence with which Mexico would view the introduction of slavery into any portion of the Territory which she was about to cede to the United States. The clause of prohibition was not inserted in consequence of the firm ground taken by Mr. Trist, and his declaration that it was an utter impossibility to mention the subject.

I take it then, sir—and availing myself of the benefit of the discussions which took place on a former occasion on this question, and which I think have left the whole country under the impression of the non-existence of slavery within the whole of the Territory in the ceded Territories—I take it for granted that what I have said, aided by the reflection of gentlemen, will satisfy them of that first truth, that slavery does not exist there by law, unless slavery was carried there the moment the treaty was ratified by the two parties, and under the operation of the Constitution of the United

States. Now, really, I must say that upon the idea that *eo instanti* upon the consummation of the treaty, the Constitution of the United States spread itself over the acquired Territory, and carried along with it the institution of slavery, the proposition is so irreconcilable with any comprehension or reason that I possess, that I hardly know how to meet it.

Why, these United States consist of thirty States. In fifteen of them there was slavery, in fifteen of them slavery did not exist. Well, how can it be argued that the fifteen slave States, by the operation of the Constitution of the United States, carried into the ceded Territory their institution of slavery, any more than it can be argued on the other side that, by the operation of the same Constitution, the fifteen free States carried into the ceded territory the principle of freedom which they from policy have chosen to adopt within their limits? Why, sir, let me suppose a case. Let me imagine that Mexico had never abolished slavery there at all—let me suppose that it was existing in point of fact and in virtue of law, from the shores of the Pacific to those of the Gulf of Mexico, at the moment of the cession of these countries to us by the treaty in question.

With what patience would gentlemen coming from slaveholding States listen to any argument which should be urged by the free States, that notwithstanding the existence of slavery within those territories, the Constitution of the United States abolished it the moment it operated upon and took effect in the ceded territory? Well, is there not just as much ground to contend that, where a moiety of the States is free, and the other moiety is slaveholding, the principle of freedom which prevails in the one class shall operate as much as the principle of slavery which prevails in the other? Can you come, amid this conflict of interests, principles, and legislation which prevails in the two parts of the Union, to any other conclusion than that which I understand to be the conclusion of the public law of the world, of reason, and justice—that the *status* of law, as it existed at the moment of the conquest or the acquisition, remains until it is altered by the sovereign authority of the conquering or acquiring power? That is the great principle which you can scarcely turn over a page of the public law of the world without finding recognized, and every where established. The laws of Mexico, as they existed at the moment of the cession of the ceded Territories to this country, remained the laws until, and unless, they were altered by that new sovereign power which this people and these Territories come under, in consequence of the treaty of cession to the United States.

I think, then, Mr. President, that without trespassing further, or exhausting the little stock of strength which I have, and for which I shall have abundant use in the progress of the argument, I may leave that part of the subject, with two or three observations only upon the general power which I think appertains to this Government on the subject of slavery.

Sir, before I approach that subject, allow me to say that, in my humble judgment, the institution of slavery presents two questions totally distinct, and resting on entirely different grounds—slavery within the States, and slavery without the States. Congress, the General Government, has no power, under the Constitution of the United States, to touch slavery within the States, except in three specified particulars in that instrument; to adjust the subject of representation; to impose taxes when a system of direct taxation is made; and to perform the duty of surrendering, or causing to be delivered up, fugitive slaves that may escape from service which they owe in slave States, and take refuge in free States. And, sir, I am ready to say that if Congress were to attack, within the States, the institution of slavery, for the purpose of the overthrow or extinction of slavery, then, Mr. Presi-

dent, my voice would be for war; then would be made a case which would justify in the sight of God, and in the presence of the nations of the earth, resistance on the part of the slave States to such an unconstitutional and usurped attempt as would be made on the supposition which I have stated.

Then we should be acting in defense of our rights, our domicils, our property, our safety, our lives; and then, I think, would be furnished a case in which the slaveholding States would be justified by all considerations which pertain to the happiness and security of man, to employ every instrument which God or nature had placed in their hands to resist such an attempt on the part of the free States. And then, if unfortunately civil war should break out, and we should present to the nations of the earth the spectacle of one portion of this Union endeavoring to subvert an institution in violation of the Constitution and the most sacred obligations which can bind men; we should present the spectacle in which we should have the sympathies, the good wishes, and the desire for our success of all men who love justice and truth. Far different, I fear, would be our case—if unhappily we should be plunged into civil war—if the two parts of this country should be placed in a position hostile toward each other, in order to carry slavery into the new Territories acquired from Mexico.

Mr. President, we have heard, all of us have read of the efforts of France to propagate—what, on the continent of Europe? Not slavery, sir; not slavery, but the rights of man; and we know the fate of her efforts in a work of that kind. But if the two portions of this Confederacy should unhappily be involved in civil war, in which the effort on the one side would be to restrain the introduction of slavery into new Territories, and on the other side to force its introduction there, what a spectacle should we present to the contemplation of astonished mankind! An effort not to propagate right, but I must say—though I trust it will be understood to be said with no desire to excite feeling—an effort to propagate wrong in the territories thus acquired from Mexico. It would be a war in which we should have no sympathy, no good wishes, and in which all mankind would be against us, and in which our own history itself would be against us; for, from the commencement of the Revolution down to the present time, we have constantly reproached our British ancestors for the introduction of slavery into this country; and allow me to say that, in my opinion, it is one of the best defenses which can be made to preserve the institution in this country, that it was forced upon us against the wishes of our ancestors, our own colonial ancestors, and by the cupidity of our British commercial ancestors.

The power then, Mr. President, in my opinion—and I will extend it to the introduction as well as the prohibition of slavery in the new territories—I think the power does exist in Congress, and I think there is that important distinction between slavery outside of the States and slavery inside of the States, that all outside is debatable, all inside of the States is undebatable. The Government has no right to touch the institution within the States; but whether she has, and to what extent she has the right or not to touch it outside of the States, is a question which is debatable, and upon which men may honestly and fairly differ, but which, decided however it may be decided, furnishes, in my judgment, no just occasion for breaking up this happy and glorious Union of ours.

Now, I am not going to take up that part of the subject which relates to the power of Congress to legislate either within this District—(I shall have occasion to make some observations upon that when I approach the resolution relating to the District)—either within this District or the Territories

But I must say, in a few words, that I think there are two sources of power, either of which is, in my judgment, sufficient to warrant the exercise of the power, if it was deemed proper to exercise it, either to introduce or to keep out slavery outside the States, within the territories.

Mr. President, I shall not take up time, of which already so much has been consumed, to show that, according to my sense of the Constitution of the United States, or rather according to the sense in which the clause has been interpreted for the last fifty years, the clause which confers on Congress the power to regulate the Territories and other property of the United States conveys the authority.

Mr. President, with my worthy friend from Michigan—and I use the term in the best and most emphatic sense, for I believe he and I have known each other longer than he and I have known any other senator in this hall—I can not concur, although I entertain the most profound respect for the opinions he has advanced upon the subject, adverse to my own; but I must say, when a point is settled by all the elementary writers of our country, by all the departments of our Government, legislative, executive, and judicial—when it has been so settled for a period of fifty years, and never was seriously disturbed until recently, that I think, if we are to regard any thing as fixed and settled under the administration of this Constitution of ours, it is a question which has thus been invariably and uniformly settled in a particular way. Or are we to come to this conclusion that nothing, nothing on earth is settled under this Constitution, but that every thing is unsettled?

Mr. President, we have to recollect it is very possible—sir, it is quite likely—that when that Constitution was framed, the application of it to such Territories as Louisiana, Florida, California, and New Mexico was never within the contemplation of its framers. It will be recollected that when that Constitution was framed the whole country northwest of the river Ohio was unpeopled; and it will be recollected also, that the exercise and the assertion of the power to make governments for Territories in their infant state, are, in the nature of the power, temporary, and to terminate whenever they have acquired a population competent for self-government. Sixty thousand is the number fixed by the ordinance of 1787. Now, sir, recollect that when this Constitution was adopted, and that Territory was unpeopled, is it possible that Congress, to whom it had been ceded by the States for the common benefit of the ceding State and all other members of the Union—is it possible that Congress had no right whatever to declare what description of settlers should occupy the public lands?

Suppose they took up the opinion that the introduction of slavery would enhance the value of the land, and enable them to command for the public treasury a greater amount from that source of revenue than by the exclusion of slaves, would they not have had the right to say, in fixing the rules, regulations, or whatever you choose to call them, for the government of that Territory, that any one that chooses to bring slaves may bring them, if it will enhance the value of the property, in the clearing and cultivation of the soil, and add to the importance of the country? Or take the reverse:—Suppose Congress had thought that a greater amount of revenue would be derived from the waste lands beyond the Ohio river by the interdiction of slavery, would they not have had a right to interdict it? Why, sir, remember how these settlements were made, and what was their progress. They began with a few. I believe that about Marietta the first settlement was made.

It was a settlement of some two or three hundred persons from New

England. Cincinnati, I believe, was the next point where a settlement was made. It was settled perhaps by a few persons from New Jersey, or some other State. Did those few settlers, the moment they arrived there, acquire sovereign rights? Had those few persons power to dispose of these territories? Had they even power to govern themselves—the handful of men who established themselves at Marietta or Cincinnati? No, sir, the contemplation of the Constitution no doubt was, that, inasmuch as this power was temporary, as it is applicable to unpeopled territory, and as that territory will become peopled gradually, insensibly, until it reaches a population which may entitle it to the benefit of self-government, in the mean time it is right and proper that Congress, who owns the soil, should regulate the settlement of the soil, and govern the settlers on the soil, until those settlers acquire number and capacity to govern themselves.

Sir, I will not further dwell upon this part of the subject; but I said there is another source of power equally satisfactory, equally conclusive in my mind, as that which relates to the territories, and that is the treaty-making power—the acquiring power. Now, I put it to gentlemen, is there not at this moment a power somewhere existing either to admit or exclude slavery from the ceded territory? It is not an annihilated power. This is impossible. It is a subsisting, actual, existing power; and where does it exist? It existed, I presume no one will controvert, in Mexico prior to the cession of these territories. Mexico could have abolished slavery or introduced slavery either in California or New Mexico. That must be conceded. Who will controvert this position? Well, Mexico has parted from the territory and from the sovereignty over the territory; and to whom did she transfer it? She transferred the territory and the sovereignty of the territory to the Government of the United States.

The Government of the United States acquires in sovereignty and in territory over California and New Mexico, all, either in sovereignty or territory, that Mexico held in California or New Mexico, by the cession of those territories. Sir, dispute that who can. The power exists or it does not; no one will contend for its annihilation. It existed in Mexico. No one, I think, can deny that. Mexico alienates the sovereignty over the territory, and her alience is the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States, then, possesses all power which Mexico possessed over the ceded territories, and the Government of the United States can do in reference to them—within, I admit, certain limits of the Constitution—whatever Mexico could have done. There are prohibitions upon the power of Congress within the Constitution, which prohibitions, I admit, must apply to Congress whenever she legislates, whether for the old States or for new territories; but, within those prohibitions, the powers of the United States over the ceded territories are co-extensive and equal to the powers of Mexico in the ceded territories, prior to the cession.

Sir, in regard to this treaty-making power, all who have any occasion to examine into its character and to the possible extent to which it may be carried, know that it is a power unlimited in its nature, except in so far as any limitation may be found in the Constitution of the United States; and upon this subject there is no limitation which prescribes the extent to which the powers should be exercised. I know, sir, it is argued that there is no grant of power in the Constitution, in specific terms, over the subject of slavery any where; and there is no grant in the Constitution to Congress specifically over the subject of a vast variety of matters upon which the powers of Congress may unquestionably operate. The major includes the minor. The general grant of power comprehends all the particulars and

elements of which that power consists. The power of acquisition by treaty draws after it the power of government of the country acquired.

If there be a power to acquire, there must be, to use the language of the tribunal that sits below, a power to govern. I think, therefore, sir, without, at least for the present, dwelling further on this part of the subject, that to the two sources of authority in Congress to which I have referred, and especially to the last, may be traced the power of Congress to act in the territories in question; and, sir, I go to the extent, and I think it is a power in Congress equal to the introduction or exclusion of slavery. I admit the argument in both its forms; I admit if the argument be maintained that the power exists to exclude slavery, it necessarily follows that the power must exist, if Congress choose to exercise it, to tolerate or introduce slavery within the territories.

But, sir, I have been drawn off so far from the second resolution—not from the object of it, but from a particular view of it—that it has almost gone out of my recollection. The resolution asserts—

"That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any of the territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction into or exclusion from any part of the said territory; and that appropriate territorial governments ought to be established by Congress in all of the said territory, not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery."

The other truth which I respectfully and with great deference conceive to exist, and which is announced in this resolution, is, that slavery is not likely to be introduced into any of these territories. Well, sir, is not that a fact? Is there a member who hears me that will not confirm the fact? What has occurred within the last three months? In California, more than in any other portion of the ceded territory, was it most probable, if slavery was adapted to the interests of the industrial pursuits of the inhabitants, that slavery would have been introduced. Yet, within the space of three or four months, California herself has declared, by a unanimous vote of her convention, against the introduction of slavery within her limits. And, as I remarked on a former occasion, this declaration was not confined to non-slaveholders.

There were persons from the slaveholding States who concurred in that declaration. Thus this fact which is asserted in the resolution is responded to by the act of California. Then, sir, if we come down to those mountain regions which are to be found in New Mexico, the nature of its soil and country, its barrenness, its unproductive character, every thing which relates to it, and every thing which we hear of it and about it, must necessarily lead to the conclusion which I have mentioned, that slavery is not likely to be introduced into them.—Well, sir, if it be true that by law slavery does not now exist in the ceded territories, and that it is not likely to be introduced into the ceded territories—if you, senators, agree to these truths, or a majority of you, as I am persuaded a large majority of you must agree to them—where is the objection or the difficulty to your announcing them to the whole world? Why should you hesitate or falter in the promulgation of incontestable truths? On the other hand, with regard to senators coming from the free States, allow me here to make, with reference to California, one or two observations.

When this feeling within the limits of your States was gotten up; when the Wilmot proviso was disseminated through them, and your people and

yourselves attached themselves to that proviso, what was the state of facts? The state of facts at the time was, that you apprehended the introduction of slavery there. You did not know much—very few of us now know much—about those very territories. They were far distant from you. You were apprehensive that slavery might be introduced there. You wanted as a protection to introduce the interdiction called the Wilmot proviso. It was in this state of want of information that the whole North blazed up in behalf of this Wilmot proviso. It was under the apprehension that slavery might be introduced there that you left your constituents. For when you came from home, at the time you left your respective residences, you did not know the fact, which has only reached us since the commencement of the session of Congress, that a constitution has been unanimously adopted by the people of California, excluding slavery from their Territory.

Well, now, let me suppose that two years ago it had been known in the free States that such a constitution would be adopted; let me suppose that it had been believed that in no other portion of these ceded territories would slavery be introduced; let me suppose that upon this great subject of solicitude, negro slavery, the people of the North had been perfectly satisfied that there was no danger; let me also suppose that they had foreseen the excitement, the danger, the irritation, the resolutions which have been adopted by Southern Legislatures, and the manifestations of opinion by the people of the slaveholding States—let me suppose that all this had been known at the North at the time when the agitation was first got up upon the subject of this Wilmot proviso—do you believe that it would have ever reached the height to which it has attained? Do any of you believe it? And if, prior to your departure from your respective homes, you had had an opportunity of conferring with your constituents upon this most leading and important fact—of the adoption of a constitution excluding slavery in California—do you not believe, senators and representatives coming from the free States, that if you had the advantage of that fact told in serious, calm, fire-side conversation with your constituents, they would not have told you to come here and to settle all these agitating questions without danger to this Union?

What do you want? What do you want who reside in the free States? You want that there shall be no slavery introduced into the territories acquired from Mexico. Well, have not you got it in California already, if admitted as a State? Have not you got it in New Mexico, in all human probability, also? What more do you want? You have got what is worth a thousand Wilmot provisos. You have got nature itself on your side. You have the fact itself on your side. You have the truth staring you in the face that no slavery is existing there. Well, if you are men; if you can rise from the mud and slough of party struggles and elevate yourselves to the height of patriots, what will you do? You will look at the fact as it exists. You will say, this fact was unknown to my people. You will say, they acted on one set of facts, we have got another set of facts here influencing us, and we will act as patriots, as responsible men, as lovers of unity and above all of this Union. We will act on the altered set of facts unknown to our constituents, and we will appeal to their justice, their honor, their magnanimity, to concur with us on this occasion, for establishing concord and harmony, and maintaining the existence of this glorious Union.

Well, Mr. President, I think, entertaining these views, that there was nothing extravagant in the hope in which I indulged when these resolutions were prepared and offered—nothing extravagant in the hope that the

North might content itself even with striking out as unnecessary these two declarations. They are unnecessary for any purpose the free States have in view. At all events, if they should insist upon Congress expressing the opinions which are here asserted, they should limit their wishes to the simple assertion of them, without insisting on their being incorporated in any territorial Government which Congress may establish in the territories.

I pass on from the second resolution to the third and fourth, which relate to Texas: and allow me to say, Mr. President, that I approach the subject with a full knowledge of all its difficulties; and of all the questions connected with or growing out of this institution of slavery, which Congress is called upon to pass upon and decide, there are none so difficult and troublesome as those which relate to Texas, because, sir, Texas has a question of boundary to settle, and the question of slavery, or the feelings connected with it, run into the question of boundary. The North, perhaps, will be anxious to contract Texas within the narrowest possible limits, in order to exclude all beyond her to make it a free territory; the South, on the contrary, may be anxious to extend those sources of Rio Grande, for the purpose of creating an additional theater for slavery; and thus, to the question of the limits of Texas, and the settlement of her boundary, the slavery question, with all its troubles and difficulties, is added, meeting us at every step we take.

There is, sir, a third question, also, adding to the difficulty. By the resolution of annexation, slavery was interdicted in all north of 36° 30′; but of New Mexico, that portion of it which lies north of 36° 30′ embraces, I think, about one third of the whole of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande; so that you have free and slave territory mixed, boundary and slavery mixed together, and all these difficulties are to be encountered. And allow me to say, sir, that among the considerations which induced me to think it was necessary to settle all these questions, was the state of things that now exists in New Mexico, and the state of things to be apprehended both there and in other portions of the territories. Why, sir, at this moment—and I think I shall have the concurrence of the two senators from that State when I announce the fact—at this moment there is a feeling approximating to abhorrence on the part of the people of New Mexico at the idea of any union with Texas.

Mr. Rusk. Only, sir, on the part of the office-seekers and army followers, who have settled there, and attempted to mislead the people.

Mr. Clay. Ah! sir, that may be, and I am afraid that New Mexico is not the only place where this class composes a majority of the whole population of the country.—[Laughter.]

Now, sir, if the questions are not settled which relate to Texas, her boundaries, and so forth, and to the territory now claimed by Texas and disputed by New Mexico—the territories beyond New Mexico which are excluded from California—if these questions are not all settled, I think they will give rise to future confusion, disorder and anarchy there, and to agitation here. There will be, I have no doubt, a party still at the North crying out, if these questions are not settled this session, for the Wilmot proviso, or some other restriction upon them, and we shall absolutely do nothing, in my opinion, if we do not accommodate all these difficulties and provide against the recurrence of all these dangers.

Sir, with respect to the state of things in New Mexico, allow me to call the attention of the Senate to what I consider as the highest authority I could offer to them as to the state of things there existing. I mean the acts of their Convention, unless that Convention happens to have been com-

posed altogether of office-seekers, office-holders, and so forth. Now, sir, I call your attention to what they say in depicting their own situation.

Mr. Underwood, at Mr. Clay's request, read the following extract from instructions adopted by the Convention, appended to the journal of the Convention of the Territory of New Mexico, held at the city of Santa Fé, in September, 1849.

"We, the people of New Mexico, in Convention assembled, having elected a delegate to represent this Territory in the Congress of the United States, and to urge upon the Supreme Government a redress of our grievances, and the protection due to us as citizens of our common country, under the Constitution, instruct him as follows: That whereas, for the last three years we have suffered under the paralyzing effects of a government undefined and doubtful in its character, inefficient to protect the rights of the people, or to discharge the high and absolute duty of every Government, the enforcement and regular administration of its own laws, in consequence of which, industry and enterprise are paralyzed and discontent and confusion prevail throughout the land. The want of proper protection against the various barbarous tribes of Indians that surround us on every side has prevented the extension of settlements upon our valuable public domain, and rendered utterly futile every attempt to explore or develop the great resources of the territory.

"Surrounded by the Utahs, Camanches, and Apaches, on the North, East and South, by the Navajos on the West, with Jicarillas within our limits, and without any adequate protection against their hostile inroads, our flocks and herds are driven off by thousands, our fellow-citizens, men, women, and children, are murdered or carried into captivity. Many of our citizens, of all ages and sexes, are at this moment suffering all the horrors of barbarian bondage, and it is utterly out of our power to obtain their release from a condition to which death would be preferable. The wealth of our territory is being diminished. We have neither the means nor any adopted plan of Government for the education of the rising generation. In fine, with a government temporary, doubtful, uncertain, and inefficient in character and in operation, surrounded and despoiled by barbarous foes, ruin appears inevitably before us, unless speedy and effectual protection be extended to us by the Congress of the United States."

There is a series of resolutions, Mr. President, which any gentleman may look at, if he chooses; but I think it is not worth while to take up the time of the Senate in reading them.

That is the condition, sir, of New Mexico. Well, I suspect that to go beyond it, to go beyond the Rio Grande to the territory which is not claimed by Texas, you will not find a much better state of things. In fact, sir, I can not for a moment reconcile it to my sense of duty to suffer Congress to adjourn without an effort, at least, being made to extend the benefits, the blessings of government to those people who have recently been acquired by us.

Sir, with regard to that portion of New Mexico which lies east of the Rio Grande, undoubtedly, if it is conceded to Texas, while she has two parties, disliking each other as much as those office-holders and office-seekers alluded to by the senator from Texas, if they could possibly be drawn together and governed quietly, peaceably, and comfortably, there might be a remedy, so far as relates to the country east of the Rio Grande; but all beyond it—Deseret and the North of California—would be still open and liable to all the consequences of disunion, confusion and anarchy, without some stable government emanating from the authority of the nation

of which they now compose a part, and with which they are but little acquainted. I think, therefore, that all these questions, difficult and troublesome as they may be, ought to be met—met in a spirit of candor and calmness, and decided upon as a matter of duty.

Now, these two resolutions which we have immediately under consideration propose a decision of these questions. I have said, sir, that there is scarcely a resolution in the series which I have offered that does not contain some mutual concession or evidence of mutual forbearance, where the concession was not altogether from the non-slaveholding to the slaveholding States.

Now, with respect to this resolution proposing a boundary for Texas, what is it? We know the difference of opinion which has existed in this country with respect to that boundary. We know that a very large portion of the people of the United States have supposed that the western limit of Texas was the Nueces, and that it did not extend to the Rio Grande. We know, by the resolution of annexation, that the question of what is the western limit and the northern limit of Texas was an open question—that it has been all along an open question. It was an open question when the boundary was run, in virtue of the Act of 1838, marking the boundary between the United States and Texas. Sir, at that time the boundary authorized by the Act of 1838 was a boundary commencing at the mouth of the Sabine and running up to its head, thence to Red River, thence westwardly with Red River to, I think, the hundredth degree of west longitude. Well, sir, that did not go so far as Texas now claims, and why? Because it was an open question. War was yet raging between Texas and Mexico; it was not foreseen exactly what might be her ultimate limits. But, sir, we will come to the question of what was done at the time of her annexation.

The whole resolution which relates to the question of boundary, from beginning to end, assumes an open boundary, an unascertained, unfixed boundary to Texas on the West. Sir, what is the first part of the resolution? It is that "Congress doth consent that the Territory properly included within and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas may be erected into a new State." Properly including—rightfully belonging to. The resolution specifies no boundary. It could specify none. It has specified no western or northern boundary for Texas. It has assumed in this state of uncertainty what we know in point of fact existed. But then the latter part of it: "Said State to be formed subject to the adjustment of all questions of boundary that may arise with other Governments, and the constitution thereof," &c. That is to say, she is annexed with her rightful and proper boundaries, without a specification of them; but inasmuch as it was known that these boundaries at the west and the north were unsettled, the Government of the United States retained to itself the power of settling with any foreign nation what the boundary should be.

Now, sir, it is impossible for me to go into the whole question and to argue it fully. I mean to express opinions or impressions, rather than to go into the entire argument. The western and northern limit of Texas being unsettled, and the Government of the United States having retained the power of settling it, I ask, suppose the power had been exercised, and that there had been no cession of territory by Mexico to the United States, but that the negotiations between the countries had been limited simply to the fixation of the western and northern limits of Texas, could it not have been done by the United States and Mexico conjointly? Will any one dispute it? Suppose there had been a treaty of limits of Texas concluded

between Mexico and the United States, fixing the Nueces as the western limit of Texas, would not Texas have been bound by it? Why, by the express terms of the resolution she would have been bound by it; or if it had been the Colorado or the Rio Grande, or any other boundary, whatever western limit had been fixed by the joint action of the two powers, would have been binding and obligatory upon Texas by the express terms of the resolution by which she was admitted into the Union. Now, sir, Mexico and the United States conjointly, by treaty, might have fixed upon the western and northern limits of Texas, and if the United States have acquired by treaty all the subjects upon which the limits of Texas might have operated, have not the United States now the power solely and exclusively which Mexico and the United States conjointly possessed prior to the late treaty between the two countries? It seems to me, sir, that this conclusion and reasoning are perfectly irresistible. If Mexico and the United States could have fixed upon any western limit for Texas, and did not do it, and if the United States have acquired to themselves, or acquired by the treaty in question, all the territory upon which the western limit must have been fixed, when it was fixed, it seems to me that no one can resist the logical conclusion, that the United States now have themselves a power to do what the United States and Mexico conjointly could have done.

Sir, I admit it is a delicate power—an extremely delicate power. I admit that it ought to be exercised in a spirit of justice, liberality, and generosity toward this the youngest member of the great American family. But here the power is. Possibly, sir, upon that question—however I offer no positive opinion—possibly, if the United States were to fix it in a way unjust in the opinion of Texas, and contrary to her rights, she might bring the question before the Supreme Court of the United States, and have it there again investigated and decided. I say possibly, sir, because I am not one of that class of politicians who believe that every question is a competent and proper question for the Supreme Court of the United States. There are questions too large for any tribunal of that kind to try; great political questions, national territorial questions, which transcend their limits; for such questions their powers are utterly incompetent. Whether this be one of those questions or not, I shall not decide; but I will maintain that the United States are now invested solely and exclusively with that power which was common to both nations—to fix, ascertain, and settle the western and northern limits of Texas.

Sir, the other day my honorable friend who represents so well the State of Texas said that we had no more right to touch the limits of Texas than we had to touch the limits of Kentucky. I think that was the illustration he gave us—that a State is one and indivisible, and that the General Government has no right to sever it. I agree with him, sir, in that; where the limits are ascertained and certain, where they are undisputed and indisputable. The General Government has no right, nor has any other earthly power the right, to interfere with the limits of a State whose boundaries are thus fixed, thus ascertained, known, and recognized. The whole power, at least, to interfere with it is voluntary. The extreme case may be put—one which I trust in God may never happen in this nation—of a conquered nation, and of a constitution adapting itself to the state of subjugation or conquest to which it has been reduced; and giving up whole States, as well as parts of States, in order to save from the conquering arms of the invader what remains. I say such a power in case of extremity may exist. But I admit that, short of such extremity, voluntarily, the General Government has no right to separate a State—to take a portion of its ter-

ritory from it, or to regard it otherwise than as integral, one and indivisible, and not to be affected by any legislation of ours. But, then, I assume what does not exist in the case of Texas, and these boundaries must be known, ascertained, and indisputable. With regard to Texas, all was open, all was unfixed; all is unfixed at this moment, with respect to her limits west and north of the Nueces.

But, sir, we gave fifteen millions of dollars for this territory that we bought, and God knows what a costly bargain to this now distracted country it has been! We gave fifteen millions of dollars for the territory ceded to us by Mexico. Can Texas justly, fairly, and honorably come into the Union and claim all that she asserted a right to, without paying any portion of the fifteen millions of dollars which constituted the consideration of the grant by the ceding nation to the United States? She proposes no such thing. She talks, indeed, about the United States having been her agent, her trustee. Why, sir, the United States was no more her agent or her trustee than she was the agent or trustee of the whole people of the United States. Texas involved herself in war—(I mean to make this no reproach—none—none—upon the past)—Texas brought herself into a state of war, and when she got into that war, it was not the war of Texas and Mexico, but it was the war of the whole thirty United States and Mexico; it was a war in which the Government of the United States, which created the hostilities, was as much the trustee and agent of the twenty-nine other States composing the Union as she was the trustee and agent of Texas. And, sir, with respect to all these circumstances—such, for example, as a treaty with a map annexed, as in the case of the recent treaty with Mexico; such as the opinion of individuals highly respected and eminent, like the lamented Mr. Polk, late President of the United States, whose opinion was that he had no right, as President of the United States, or in any character otherwise than as negotiating with Mexico—and in that the Senate would have to act in concurrence with him—that he had no right to fix the boundary; and as to the map attached to the treaty, it is sufficient to say that the treaty itself is silent from beginning to end on the subject of the fixation of the boundary of Texas. The annexation of the map to the treaty was a matter of no utility, for the treaty is not strengthened by it; it no more affirms the truth of any thing delineated upon the map in relation to Texas than it does any thing in relation to any other geographical subject that composed the map.

Mr. President, I have said that I think the power has been concentrated in the Government of the United States to fix upon the limits of the State of Texas. I have said also that this power ought to be exercised in a spirit of great liberality and justice; and I put it to you, sir, to say, in reference to this second resolution of mine, whether that liberality and justice have not been displayed in the resolution which I have proposed. In the resolution, what is proposed? To confine her to the Nueces? No, sir. To extend her boundary to the mouth of the Rio Grande, and thence up that river to the southern limit of New Mexico; and thence along that limit to the boundary between the United States and Spain, as marked under the treaty of 1819.

Why, sir, here is a vast country. I believe—although I have made no estimate about it—that it is not inferior in extent of land, of acres, of square miles, to what Texas east of the river Nueces, extending to the Sabine, had before. And who is there can say with truth and justice that there is no reciprocity, nor mutuality, no concession in this resolution, made to Texas, even in reference to the question of boundary alone? You

give her a vast country, equal, I repeat, in extent nearly to what she indisputably possessed before; a country sufficiently large, with her consent, hereafter to carve out of it some two or three additional States when the condition of the population may render it expedient to make new States. Sir, is there not in this resolution concession, liberality, justice? But this is not all that we propose to do. The second resolution proposes to pay off a certain amount of the debt of Texas. A blank is left in the resolution, because I have not heretofore been able to ascertain the amount.

Mr. FOOTE—Will the honorable Senator allow me to suggest that it may be agreeable to him to finish his remarks to-morrow? If such be the case, I will move that the Senate now go into Executive session.

Mr. CLAY—I am obliged to the worthy Senator from Mississippi; I do not think it possible for me to conclude to-day, and I will yield with great pleasure if—

Mr. FOOTE—I now move—

Mr. CLAY—If the Senator will permit me to conclude what I have to say in relation to Texas, I will then cheerfully yield the floor for his motion.

I was about to remark that, independently of this most liberal and generous boundary which is tendered to Texas, we propose to offer her in this second resolution a sum which the worthy Senator from Texas thinks will not be less than three millions of dollars—the exact amount neither he nor I can furnish, not having the materials at hand upon which to make a statement. Well, sir, you get this large boundary and three millions of your debt paid. I shall not repeat the argument which I urged upon a former occasion, as to the obligation of the United States to pay a portion of this debt, but was struck the other day, upon reading the treaty of limits, first between the United States and Mexico, and next the treaty of limits between the United States and Texas, to find, in the preamble of both those treaties, a direct recognition of the principle from which I think springs our obligation to pay a portion of this debt, for the payment of which the revenue of Texas was pledged before her annexation. The principle asserted in the treaty of limits with Mexico is, that whereas by the treaty of 1819, between Spain and the United States, a limit was fixed between Mexico and the United States, Mexico comprising then a portion of the possessions of the Spanish Government, although Mexico was at the date of the treaty severed from the crown of Spain, yet she, as having been a part of the possessions of the crown of Spain when the treaty of 1819 was made, was bound by that treaty as much as if it had been made by herself instead of Spain—in other words, that the severance of no part of a common empire can exonerate either portion of that empire from the obligations contracted when the empire was entire and unsevered. And, sir, the same principle is asserted in the treaty of 1838, between Texas and the United States. The principle asserted is, that the treaty of 1828 between Mexico and the United States having been made when Texas was a part of Mexico, and that now Texas being dissevered from Mexico, she nevertheless remains bound by that treaty as much as if no such severance had taken place. In other words, the principle is this—that when an independent power creates an obligation or debt, no subsequent political misfortune, no subsequent severance of the territories of that power, can exonerate it from the obligation that was created while an integral and independent power; in other words, to bring it down and apply it to this specific case—that, Texas being an independent power, and having a right to make loans and to make pledges, having raised a loan and pledged specifically

the revenues arising from the customs to the public creditor, the public creditor became invested with a right to that fund; and it is a right of which he could not be divested by any other act than one to which his own consent was given—it could be divested by no political change which Texas might think proper to make. In consequence of the absorption or merging of Texas into the United States, the creditor, being no party to the treaty which was formed, does not lose his right—he retains his right to demand the fulfillment of the pledge that was made upon this specific fund, just as if there had not been any annexation of Texas to the United States.

That was the foundation upon which I arrived at the conclusion expressed in the resolution—that the United States having appropriated to themselves the revenue arising from the imports, which revenue had been pledged to the creditor of Texas, the United States as an honorable and just power ought now to pay the debt for which those duties were solemnly pledged by a power independent in itself, and competent to make the pledge. Well, sir, I think that when you consider the large boundary which is assigned to Texas—and when you take into view the abhorrence, for I think I am warranted in using this expression—with which the people of New Mexico east of the Rio Grande will look upon any political connection with Texas—and when, in addition to this, you take into view the large grant of money that we propose to make, and our liberality in exonerating her from a portion of her public debt, equal to that grant—when we take all these circumstances into consideration, I think I have presented a case in regard to which I confess I shall be greatly surprised if the people of Texas themselves, when they come to deliberate upon these liberal offers, hesitate a moment to accede to them.

I have now got through with what I had to say in reference to this resolution, and if the Senator from Mississippi wishes it, I will give way for a motion for adjournment.

On motion of Mr. FOOTE the further consideration of the resolution was postponed, and on motion,

The Senate adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 6.

Mr. CLAY—Mr. President, if there be in this vast assembly of beauty, grace, elegance, and intelligence, any who have come here under an expectation that the humble individual who now addresses you means to attempt any display, any use of ambitious language, any extraordinary ornament or decoration of speech, they will be utterly disappointed. The season of the year, and my own season of life, both admonish me to abstain from the use of any such ornaments; but, above all, Mr. President, the awful subject upon which it is my duty to address the Senate and the country forbids my saying any thing but what pertains strictly to that subject, and my sole desire is to make myself, in seriousness, soberness, and plainness, understood by you and by those who think proper to listen to me.

When, yesterday, the adjournment of the Senate took place, at that stage of the discussion of the resolutions which I had submitted which related to Texas and her boundary, I thought I had concluded the whole subject, but I was reminded by a friend that perhaps I was not sufficiently explicit on a single point, and that is, the relation of Texas and the Government of the United States, and that portion of the debt of Texas for which I think a responsibility exists on the part of the Government of the United States.

Sir, it was said that perhaps it might be understood, in regard to the proposed grant of three millions, or whatever may be the sum when ascer-

tained, to Texas, in consideration of the surrender of her title to New Mexico this side of the Rio Grande, that we granted nothing—that we merely discharged an obligation which existed upon the Government of the United States, in consequence of the appropriation of the imports receivable in the ports of Texas while she was an independent power. But that is not my understanding, Mr. President. As between Texas and the United States, the obligation on the part of Texas to pay her portion of the debt referred to, is complete and unqualified, and there is, as between these two parties, no obligation on the part of the United States to pay one dollar of the debt of Texas. On the contrary, by an express stipulation in the resolutions of admission, it is declared and provided that in no event do the United States become liable or charged with any portion of the debt or liabilities of Texas.

It is not, therefore, for any responsibility which exists to the State of Texas, on the part of the Government of the United States, that I think provision ought to be made for that debt. No such thing. As between those two parties, the responsibility on the part of Texas is complete to pay the debt, and there is no responsibility on the part of the United States to pay one cent. But there is a third party, who was no party to the annexation whatever—that is to say, the creditor of Texas, who advanced the money on the faith of solemn pledges made by Texas to him, to reimburse the loan by the appropriation of the duties received on foreign imports; and he, and he alone, is the party to whom we are bound, according to the view which I have presented of the subject. Nor can the other creditors of Texas complain that provision is made only for a particular portion of the debt, leaving the residue of the debt unprovided for by the Government of the United States, because, in so far as we may extinguish any portion of the debt of Texas under which she is now bound, in so far will it contribute to diminish the residue of the debts of Texas, and leave the funds derived from the public lands held by Texas, and what other resources she may have, applicable to the payment of these debts, with more effect than if the entire debt, including the pledged portion as well as the unpledged portion, was obligatory upon her, and she stood bound by it. Nor can the creditors complain, for another reason.

Texas has all the resources which she had when an independent power, with the exception of the duties receivable in her ports upon foreign imports, and she is exempted from certain charges, expenditures, and responsibilities which she would have had to encounter if she had remained a separate and independent power: for example, she would have had to provide for a certain amount of naval force and for a certain amount perhaps of military force, in order to protect herself against Mexico or against any foreign enemy whatever. But by her annexation to the United States she became liberated from all these charges, and, of course, her entire revenues may be applicable to the payment of her debts, those only excepted which are necessary to the support and maintenance of the Government of Texas.

With this explanation upon that part of the subject, I pass to the consideration of the next resolution in the series which I have had the honor to submit, and which relates, if I am not mistaken, to this District.

"*Resolved*, That it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, while that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, without the consent of that State, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District."

Mr. President, an objection at the moment was made to this resolution, by some honorable senator on the other side of the body, that it did not contain an assertion of the unconstitutionality of the exercise of the power of abolition. I said then, as I have uniformly maintained in this body, as I contended for in 1838, and ever have done, that the power to abolish slavery within the District of Columbia has been vested in Congress by language too clear and explicit to admit, in my judgment, of any rational doubt whatever. What, sir, is the language of the Constitution? "To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States." Now, sir, Congress, by this grant of power, is invested with all legislation whatsoever over the District.

Can we conceive of human language more broad and comprehensive than that which invests a legislative body with exclusive power, in all cases whatsoever, of legislation over a given district of territory or country? Let me ask, sir, is there any power to abolish slavery in this District? Let me suppose, in addition to what I suggested the other day, that slavery had been abolished in Maryland and Virginia—let me add to it the supposition that it was abolished in all the States in the Union; is there any power then to abolish slavery within the district of Columbia, or is slavery planted here to all eternity, without the possibility of the exercise of any legislative power for its abolition? It can not be invested in Maryland, because the power with which Congress is invested is exclusive. Maryland, therefore, is excluded, and so all the other States of the Union are excluded. It is here, or it is nowhere.

This was the view which I took in 1838, and I think there is nothing in the resolution which I offered on that occasion incompatible with the view which I now present, and which the resolution contains. While I admitted the power to exist in Congress, and exclusively in Congress, to legislate in all cases whatsoever, and consequently in the case of the abolition of slavery in this District, if it is deemed proper to do so, I admitted on that occasion, as I contend now, that it is a power which Congress can not, in conscience and good faith, exercise while the institution of slavery continues within the State of Maryland. The case, sir, is a good deal altered now from what it was twelve years ago, when the resolution to which I allude was adopted by the Senate.

Upon that occasion Virginia and Maryland both were concerned in the exercise of the power; but, by the retrocession of that portion of the District which lies south of the Potomac, Virginia became no more interested in the question of the abolition of slavery within the residue of the District than any other slaveholding State in the Union is interested in its abolition. The question now is confined to Maryland. I said on that occasion that, although the grant of power is complete, and comprehends the right to abolish slavery within the District, yet it was a thing which never could have entered into the conception of Maryland or Virginia that slavery would be abolished here while slavery continued to exist in either of those two ceding States. I say, moreover, what the grant of power itself indicates, that, although exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District was vested in Congress within the ten miles square, it was to make it the seat of Government of the United States. That was the great, prominent, substantial object of the grant, and that, in exercising all the powers with which we are invested, complete and full as they may be, yet the great purpose—that of the cession having been made in order

to create a suitable seat of Government—ought to be the leading and controlling idea with Congress in the exercise of this power.

And it is not necessary, in order to render it a proper and suitable seat of Government for the United States, that slavery should be abolished within the limits of the ten miles square. And inasmuch as at the time of the cession—when, in a spirit of generosity, immediately after the formation of the Constitution—when all was peace, and harmony, and concord—when brotherly affection and fraternal feeling prevailed throughout this whole Union—when Maryland and Virginia, in a moment of generous impulse, and with feelings of high regard toward the members of this Union, chose to make this grant, neither party could have suspected that, at some distant future period, upon the agitation of this unfortunate subject, their generous grant without equivalent was to be turned against them, and that the sword was to be uplifted, as it were, in their bosoms, to strike at their own hearts; thus this implied faith, this honorable obligation, this necessity and propriety of keeping in constant view the great object of cession. Those were considerations which in 1838 governed me, as they now influence me, in submitting the reasons which I have submitted to your consideration.

Now, as then, I do not think Congress ought ever, as an honorable body, acting *bonâ fide*, in good faith, and according to the nature and purposes, and objects of the cession, at the time it was made—and, looking at the condition of the ceding States at that time, Congress can not, without the forfeiture of all those obligations of honor which men of honor and nations of honor respect as much as if found literally in so many words in the bond itself—Congress can not interfere with the institution of slavery in this District without the violation of all these obligations, not in my opinion less sacred and less binding than if inserted in the constitutional instrument itself.

Well, sir, what does the resolution propose? The resolution neither affirms nor disaffirms the constitutionality of the exercise of the power of abolition in this District. It is silent upon the subject. It says it is inexpedient to do it, but upon certain conditions. And what are these considerations? Why, first, that the State of Maryland shall give its consent; in other words, that the State of Maryland shall release the United States from the obligation of the implied faith which I contend is connected with the act of cession by Maryland to the United States. Well, sir, if Maryland, the only State now that ceded any portion of the territory which remains to us, gives us her full consent; in other words, if she releases Congress from all obligations growing out of the cession, with regard to slavery, I consider it is removing one of the obstacles to the exercise of the power, if it were deemed expedient to exercise the power. But it is removing only one of them. There are two other conditions which are inserted in this resolution. The first is the consent of the people of the District.

Mr. President, the condition of the people of this District is anomalous. It is a condition in violation of the great principles which lie at the bottom of our own free institutions, and all free institutions, because it is the case of a people who are acted upon by legislative authority, and taxed by legislative authority, without having any voice or representation in the taxing or legislative body. The Government of the United States, in respect to the people of this District, is a tyranny, an absolute Government—not exercised hitherto, I admit, and I hope it never will be exercised, tyrannically or arbitrarily; but it is in the nature of all arbitrary power, because, if I were to give a definition of arbitrary power, I would say that

it is that power which is exercised by an authority over any people who have no voice, no representation in the assembly whose edicts or laws go forth to act upon the unrepresented people to whom I have referred.

Well, sir, that being their condition, and this question of the abolition of slavery affecting them in all the relations which we can imagine—of prosperity, society, comfort, peace, and happiness—I have required as another condition, upon which alone this power should be exercised, the consent of the people of the District. But, sir, I have not stopped there. This resolution requires still another and a third condition, and that is, that slavery shall not be abolished within the District of Columbia, although Maryland consents, although the people of the District themselves consent, without the third condition of making compensation to the owners of the slaves within the District. Sir, it is immaterial to me upon what basis this obligation to compensate for the slaves who may be liberated by the authority of Congress is placed. There is a clause in the Constitution of the United States, of the amendments to the Constitution, which declares that no private property shall be taken for public use, without just compensation being made to the owner of the property.

Well, I think, in a just and liberal interpretation of that clause, we are restrained from taking the property of the people of this District, in slaves, on considerations of any public policy, or for any conceivable or imaginable use of the public, without a full and fair compensation to the people of this District. But, without the obligation of any constitutional restriction, such as is contained in the amendment to which I refer—without that, upon the principles of eternal justice itself, we ought not to deprive those who have property in slaves, in this District, of their property, without compensating them for their full value. Why, sir, no one of the European powers, Great Britain, France, or any other of the powers which undertook to abolish slavery in their respective colonies, has ever ventured to do it without making compensation. They were under no obligation arising out of any written or other constitution to do it, but under that obligation to which all men ought to bow with homage—that obligation of eternal justice, which declares that no man ought to be deprived of his property without a full and just compensation for its value.

I know it has been argued that the clause of the Constitution which requires compensation for property taken by the public, for its use, would not apply to the case of the abolition of slavery in the District, because the property is not taken for the use of the public. Literally, perhaps, it would not be taken for the use of the public; but it would be taken in consideration of a policy and purpose adopted by the public, as one which it was deemed expedient to carry into full effect and operation; and, by a liberal interpretation of the clause, it ought to be so far regarded as taken for the use of the public, at the instance of the public, as to demand compensation to the extent of the value of the property.

If that is not a restriction as to the power of Congress over the subject of slavery in the District, then the power of Congress stands unrestricted, and that would not be a better condition for the slaveholder in the District than to assume the restriction contained in the amendment. I say it would be unrestricted by constitutional operation or injunction. The great restrictions resulting from the obligations of justice would remain, and they are sufficient to exact from Congress the duty of ascertaining, prior to the abolition of slavery, the value of the property in slaves in the District, and of making full, fair, and just compensation for that property.

Well, Mr. President, I said yesterday there was not a resolution, except the first (which contained no concession by either party), that did not either contain some mutual concession by the two parties, or did not contain concessions altogether from the North to the South.

Now with respect to the resolution under consideration. The North has contended that the power exists under the Constitution to abolish slavery. The South, I am aware, has opposed it, and most, at least a great portion of the South, have contended for the opposite construction. What does the resolution do? It asks of both parties to forbear urging their respective opinions, the one to the exclusion of the other, but it concedes to the South all that the South, it appears to me, upon this subject, ought in reason to demand, in so far as it requires such conditions as amount to an absolute security for property in slaves in the District; such conditions as will probably make the existence of slavery within the District co-eval and co-extensive with its existence in any of the States out of and beyond the District. But, sir, the second clause of this resolution provides "that it is expedient to prohibit within the District the trade in slaves brought into it from States or places beyond the limits of the District, either to be sold therein as merchandise, or to be transported to other markets."

Well, Mr. President, if the concession be made that Congress has the power of legislation, and exclusive legislation, in all cases whatsoever, how can it be doubted that Congress has authority to prohibit what is called the slave-trade in the District of Columbia? Sir, my interpretation of the Constitution is this; that, with regard to all parts of it which operate upon the States, Congress can exercise no power which is not granted, or which is not a necessary implication from a granted power. That is the rule for the action of Congress in relation to its legislation upon the States, but in relation to its legislation upon this District, the reverse. I take it to be the true rule that Congress has all power over the District which is not prohibited by some part of the Constitution of the United States; in other words, that Congress has a power within the District equivalent to, and co-extensive with, the power which any State itself possesses within its own limits. Well, sir, does any one doubt the power and the right of any slaveholding State in this Union to forbid the introduction, as merchandise, of slaves within their limits? Why, sir, almost every slaveholding State in the Union has exercised its power to prohibit the introduction of slaves as merchandise.

It was in the Constitution of my own State; and, notwithstanding all the excitement and agitation upon the subject of slavery which occurred during the past year in the State of Kentucky, the same principle is incorporated in the new Constitution. It is in the Constitution, I know, of Mississippi. That State prohibits the introduction of slaves within its limits as merchandise. I believe it to be in the Constitution or in the laws of Maryland—in the laws of Virginia—in the laws of most of the slaveholding States. It is true that the policy of the different slaveholding States upon this subject has somewhat vacillated—they sometimes adopted it and sometimes excluded it—but there has been no diversity of opinion, no departure from the great principle, that every one of them has the power and authority to prohibit the introduction of slaves within their respective limits, if they choose to exercise it. Well, then, sir, I really do not think that this resolution, which proposes to abolish that trade, ought to be considered as a concession by either class of the States to the other class.

I think it should be regarded as a common object, acceptable to both, and conformable to the wishes and feelings of both; and yet, sir, in these

times of fearful and alarming excitement—in these times when every night that I go to sleep and awake up in the morning, it is with the apprehension of some new and fearful and dreadful tidings upon this agitating subject—I have seen in the act of a neighboring State, among the various contingencies which are enumerated, upon the happening of any one of which delegates are to be sent to the famous Convention which is to assemble at Nashville in June next, that among other substantive grounds for the appointment of delegates to that Convention—of delegates from the State to which I refer—one is, that if Congress abolish the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, that shall be cause for a Convention—in other words, it is cause for considering whether this Union ought to be dissolved or not. Is it possible to portray a greater extent of extravagance to which men may be carried by the indulgence of their passions?

Sir, the power exists; the duty, in my opinion, exists; and there has been no time—as I may say, in language coincident with that used by the honorable senator from Alabama—there has been no time in my public life when I was not willing to concur in the abolition of the slave-trade in this District. I was willing to do it when Virginia's portion of the District was retroceded, that lying south of the Potomac. There is still less ground for objection to doing it now, when the District is limited to the portion this side of the Potomac, and when the motive or reason for concentrating slaves here in a depot, for the purpose of transportation to distant foreign markets, is lessened with the diminution of the District, by the retrocession of that portion to Virginia.

Why should slave-traders who buy their slaves in Maryland or Virginia, come here with their slaves in order to transport them to New Orleans or other Southern markets? Why not transport them from the States in which they are purchased? Why are the feelings of citizens here outraged by the scenes exhibited, and the corteges which pass along our avenues, of manacled human beings, not collected at all in our own neighborhood, but brought from distant parts of neighboring States? Why should they be outraged? And who is there, that has a heart, that does not contemplate a spectacle of that kind with horror and indignation? Why should they be outraged by a scene so inexcusable and detestable as this?

Sir, it is no concession, I repeat, from one class of States or from the other. It is an object in which both of them, it seems to me, should heartily unite, and which the one side as much as the other should rejoice in adopting, inasmuch as it lessens one of the causes of inquietude and dissatisfaction which are connected with this District. Abolish the slave-trade in this District; reassert the doctrine of the resolution of 1838, that by an implied assent on the part of Congress slavery ought not to be abolished in the District of Columbia, while it remains in the State of Maryland; reassert the principle of that resolution, and adopt the other healing measures—or other similar or more healing measures—for I am not attached to any thing that is the production of my own hand, if any thing better should be offered by any body else—adopt the other healing measures which are proposed, and which are required by the distracted condition of the country and I venture to say that, as we have had peace and quiet for the last twenty years, since the termination of the Missouri controversy, we shall have, in all human probability, peace for a longer period to come upon this unhappy subject of slavery.

The next resolution is:

"That more effectual provision ought to be made by law, according to the requirement of the Constitution, for the restitution and delivery of per-

sons bound to service or labor in any State, who may escape in to any other State or Territory in the Union."

Now, Mr. President, upon that subject I go with him who goes furthest in the interpretation of that clause in the Constitution. In my humble opinion, sir, it is a requirement by the Constitution of the United States which is not limited in its operation to the Congress of the United States, but extends to every State in the Union and to the officers of every State in the Union; and I go one step further; it extends to every man in the Union, and devolves upon them all an obligation to assist in the recovery of a fugitive from labor who takes refuge in or escapes into one of the free States. And, sir, I think I can maintain all this by a fair interpretation of the Constitution. It provides—

"That no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

It will be observed, Mr. President, that this clause in the Constitution is not among the enumerated powers granted to Congress, for, if that had been the case, it might have been urged that Congress alone could legislate to carry it into effect; but it is one of the general powers, or one of the general rights secured by this constitutional instrument, and it addresses itself to all who are bound by the Constitution of the United States. Now, sir, the officers of the General Government are bound to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. All State officers are required by the Constitution to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States; and all men who love their country and are obedient to its laws, are bound to assist in the execution of those laws, whether they are fundamental or derivative. I do not say that a private individual is bound to make the tour of his State in order to assist an owner of a slave to recover his property; but I do say, if he is present when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights and endeavor to obtain possession of his property, every man present, whether he be an officer of the General Government or the State Government, or a private individual, is bound to assist, if men are bound at all to assist in the execution of the laws of their country.

Now what is this provision? It is that such fugitives shall be delivered upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due. As has been already remarked in the course of the debate upon the bill upon this subject which is now pending, the language used in regard to fugitives from criminal offenses and fugitives from labor is precisely the same. The fugitive from justice is to be delivered up, and to be removed to the State having jurisdiction; the fugitive from labor is to be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due. Well, has it ever been contended on the part of any State that she is not bound to surrender a fugitive from justice, upon demand from the State from which he fled? I believe not. There have been some exceptions to the performance of this duty, but they have not denied the general right; and if they have refused in any instance to give up the person demanded, it has been upon some technical or legal ground, not at all questioning the general right to have the fugitive surrendered, or the obligation to deliver him up as intended by the Constitution.

I think, then, Mr. President, that with regard to the true interpretation of this provision of the Constitution there can be no doubt. It imposes an obligation upon all the States, free or slaveholding; it imposes an obliga-

tion upon all officers of the Government, State, or Federal; and, I will add, upon all the people of the United States, under particular circumstances, to assist in the surrender and recovery of a fugitive slave from his master.

There has been some confusion, and, I think, some misconception, on this subject, in consequence of a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that decision has been entirely misapprehended. There is a vast difference between imposing impediments and affording facilities for the recovery of fugitive slaves. The Supreme Court of the United States has only decided that all laws of impediment are unconstitutional. I know there are some general expressions in the opinion to which I have referred—the case of Maryland against Pennsylvania—that seem to import otherwise; but I think, when you come attentively to read the whole opinion, and the opinion pronounced by all the judges, especially if you take the trouble of doing what I have done, to converse with them as to what their real meaning was, you will find that the whole extent of the authority which they intended to establish was that any laws of impediment enacted by the States were laws that were forbidden by the provision of the Constitution to which I refer; that the General Government had no right, by an act of the Congress of the United States, to impose obligations upon State officers not imposed by the authority of their own Constitution and laws. It is impossible the decision could have been otherwise. It would have been perfectly extrajudicial. The Court had no right to decide the question whether the laws of facility were or were not unconstitutional.

The only question before the Court was the law of impediment passed by the Legislature of Pennsylvania; and if they had gone beyond the case before them, and undertaken to decide upon a case not before them, a principle which was not fairly comprehended within the case before them, it would be what the lawyers term an *obiter dictum*, and is not binding either on that Court itself or any other tribunal. I say it was not possible that, with the case before the Court of a law for giving facility to the holder of the slave to recover his property again, it was utterly impossible that any tribunal should pronounce a decision that such aid and assistance, rendered by the authority of the State, under this provision of the Constitution of the United States, is unconstitutional and void. The Court has not said so, or if they have said so, they have transcended their authority and gone beyond the case which was before them. Laws passed by States, in order to assist the General Government, so far from being laws repugnant to the Constitution, would every where be regarded as laws carrying out, enforcing, and fulfilling the constitutional duties which are created by that instrument.

Why, sir, as well might it be contended that if Congress were to declare war—and no one will doubt the power to declare war is vested exclusively in Congress; no State has the right to do it—no one will contend seriously, I apprehend, that after the declaration of war it would be unconstitutional on the part of any of the States to assist in the vigorous and effective prosecution of that war; and yet it would be just as unconstitutional to lend their aid to the successful and glorious termination of the war in which we might be embarked, as it would be to assist in the performance of a high duty which addresses itself to all the States and all the people of all the States.

Mr. President, I do think that that whole class of Legislation, beginning in the Northern States and extending to some of the Western

States, by which obstructions and impediments have been thrown in the way of the recovery of fugitive slaves, is unconstitutional, and has originated in a spirit which I trust will correct itself when those States come calmly to consider the nature and extent of their federal obligations. Of all the States in this Union, unless it be Virginia, the State of which I am a resident suffers most by the escape of their slaves to adjoining States.

I have very little doubt, indeed, that the extent of loss to the State of Kentucky, in consequence of the escape of her slaves is greater, at least, in proportion to the total number of slaves which are held within that commonwealth, even than in Virginia. I know full well, and so does the honorable Senator from Ohio know, that it is at the utmost hazard, and insecurity to life itself, that a Kentuckian can cross the river and go into the interior to take back his fugitive slave to the place from whence he fled. Recently an example occurred even in the city of Cincinnati, in respect to one of our most respectable citizens. Not having visited Ohio at all, but Covington, on the opposite side of the river, a little slave of his escaped over to Cincinnati. He pursued it; he found it in the house in which it was concealed; he took it out, and it was rescued by the violence and force of a negro mob from his possession—the police of the city standing by, and either unwilling or unable to afford the assistance which was requisite to enable him to recover his property.

Upon this subject I do think that we have just and serious cause of complaint against the free States. I think they fail in fulfilling a great obligation, and the failure is precisely upon one of those subjects which in its nature is the most irritating and inflaming to those who live in the slave States.

Now, sir, I think it is a mark of no good neighborhood, of no kindness, of no courtesy, that a man living in a slave State can not now, with any sort of safety, travel in the free States with his servants, although he has no purpose whatever of stopping there longer than a short time. And on this whole subject, sir, how has the legislation of the free States altered for the worse within the course of the last twenty or thirty years? Why, sir, most of those States, until within a period of the last twenty or thirty years, had laws for the benefit of sojourners, as they were called, passing through or abiding for the moment in the free States, with their servants. Sir, I recollect a case that occurred during the war. My friend, Mr. Cheves, of South Carolina, instead of going home in the vacation, went to Philadelphia, taking his family servants with him. Some of the Abolitionists of that city took out a habeas corpus, seized the slaves, and the question was brought before the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, where it was argued for days.

It was necessary, during the progress of the arguments, to refer to a great variety of statutes passed from time to time by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the sojourner, guaranteeing and securing to him the possession of his property during his tempory passage or abode within the limits of that commonwealth. Finally, the court gave their opinion *seriatim*—each judge his separate opinion, until it came to Judge Breckenridge to deliver his, who was the youngest judge, I think, on the bench. During the progress of the delivery of their opinions they had frequently occasion to refer to the acts passed for the benefit of sojourners; and each of the judges who preceded Mr. Breckenridge always pronounced the word "sudgeners." When it came to Judge Breckenridge to deliver his opinion, he said, "I agree in all that my learned brethren have pronounced upon this occasion, except in their pronunciation of the word 'sojourner.' They

pronounced it 'sudgener;' but I call it 'sojourner.'" [Laughter.] Well, now, sir, all these laws in behalf of these sojourners through the free States are swept away, except I believe in the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Dayton—And New Jersey.

Mr. Clay—Ay, and in New Jersey. I am happy to hear it; but in most of the large States, in most, if not all, of the New England States, these laws have been abolished, showing the progressive tendency of bad neighborhood and unkind action on the part of the free States toward the slaveholding States.

Mr. President, I do not mean to contest the ground—I am not going to argue the question, whether, if a man carries his slave voluntarily into the free States and he is not a fugitive, whether that slave, by the voluntary action of the master, does or does not become instantly entitled to his freedom. I am not going to argue that question. I know what the decision has been at the North, but I mean to say it is unkind, it is unneighborly, it is not in the spirit of fraternal connection which exists between the members of this confederacy, to execute a strict legal principle in the way suggested, even supposing it to be right so to do. But where there is no purpose of permanent abode, no intention of settling finally and conclusively, and planting his slaves within the commonwealth, it is but right, and a proof of good neighborhood and kind and friendly feeling, to allow the owner of the slave to pass with his property unmolested through your State.

Allow me to say upon the subject, though it is perhaps going further into detail than is necessary, that of all the exercise of power of those who attempt to seduce from their owners their slaves, there is no instance in which it is exercised so injuriously to the objects of their charity and benevolence as in the case of the seduction of family slaves from the service of their owner. The slaves in a family are treated with all the kindness that the children of the family receive. Every thing which they want for their comfort is given them with the most liberal indulgence; and, sir, I have known more instances than one where, by this practice of the seduction of family servants from their owners, they have been rendered wretched and unhappy in the free States; and in my own family, a slave who had been seduced away, addressed her mistress and begged and implored of her the means of getting back from the state of freedom to which she had been seduced, to the state of slavery in which she was so much more happy; and in the case to which I have referred the means were afforded her, and she returned to the State of Kentucky to her mistress.

Then, Mr. President, I think that the existing laws upon the subject, for the recovery of fugitive slaves, and the restoration and delivering of them up to their owners, being found inadequate and ineffective, it is incumbent on Congress—and I hope hereafter, in a better state of feeling, when more harmony and good-will prevail among the members of this confederacy, it will be regarded by the free States themselves as a part of their duty also—to assist in allaying this irritating and disturbing subject to the peace of our Union; but, at all events, whether they do it or not, it is our duty to do it. It is our duty to make the law more effective, and I shall go with the senator from the South who goes furthest in making penal laws and imposing the heaviest sanctions for the recovery of fugitive slaves, and the restoration of them to their owners.

Mr. President, upon this part of the subject, however, allow me to make an observation or two. I do not think the States, as States, ought to be responsible for all the misconduct of particular individuals within those

States. I think that the States are only to be held responsible when they act in their sovereign capacity. If there are few persons, indiscreet, mad, if you choose—fanatics, if you choose so to call them—who are for dissolving this Union, as we know there are some at the North, and for dissolving it in consequence of the connection which exists between the free and slaveholding States, I do not think that any State in which such madmen as they are to be found, ought to be held responsible for the doctrines they propagate, unless the State itself adopts those doctrines.

Sir, there have been, perhaps, mutual causes of complaint; and I know, at least I have heard, that Massachusetts, for some of her unfriendly laws on the subject of the recovery of fugitive slaves, urges as the motive for the passage of those laws the treatment which a certain minister of hers experienced in Charleston some years ago. Mr. Hoar, I think, is the name of the individual who was sent to South Carolina to take care of the free negroes of Massachusetts that might pass to Charleston in the vessels of Massachusetts. I think it was a mission that it was hardly worthy of Massachusetts to create. I think she might have omitted to send Mr. Hoar upon any such mission; but she thought it right to send him, and he went there for the purpose of asserting, as he said, the rights of those free people of color before the courts of justice, and of testing the validity of certain laws in South Carolina with regard to the prohibition of free negroes from coming into her ports. I believe that was the object, that was the purpose of his mission. He went there to create no disturbance, as I understand, except so far as asserting those rights and privileges, in the sense in which Massachusetts held them, might create disturbance. He was virtually driven out of Charleston, as I believe he or some other emissary of the same kind was driven out of New Orleans. I do not mean to say whether it was right or wrong to expel him. What I mean to say is, that Massachusetts, or some of her citizens, has said, that, after finding this treatment toward those whom she chooses to consider citizens, on the part of South Carolina, she determined on that course of legislation by which she has withdrawn all aid and assistance for the recovery of fugitives, and interposes obstacles; and then she pleads the treatment of Mr. Hoar as an apology. I think that furnished her with no sufficient apology. If South Carolina treated her ill, it is no reason why she should ill treat Kentucky and Virginia, and other slaveholding States that had done her no wrong. But she thought so.

I mention both cases—the case of the expulsion of Mr. Hoar from Charleston, and the passage of the laws of Massachusetts—not by way of approbation of either, but to show that there have been, unhappily, mutual causes of agitation, furnished by one class of States as well as by the other; though, I admit, not in the same degree by the slave States as by the free States. And I admit, also, that the free States have much less cause for anxiety and solicitude on this subject of slavery than the slave States, and that far more extensive excuses, if not justification, ought to be extended to the slave than the free States, on account of the difference of the condition of the respective parties.

Mr. President, passing from that resolution, I will add only a single observation, that when the bill comes up to be finally acted on, I will vote most cordially and heartily for it.

Mr. Davis, of Massachusetts—Will the honorable Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment? I want to say one word in behalf of the State of Massachusetts, with his permission.

Mr. Clay—Certainly, certainly.

Mr. Davis—I have never, although most likely he may have, heard the apology stated by the honorable senator for passing the law to which he has referred; but on the contrary I have always understood that the law which Massachusetts had for restoring fugitive slaves, was repealed because the courts below, as they understood it, had pronounced their law unconstitutional. That is the ground which they took; whether they were wise in the legislation they adopted I shall not undertake to say. But I wish to say one word in regard to the mission, as it is termed by the honorable senator from Kentucky, to South Carolina.

If I call the facts to my recollection correctly, they are these. We are the owners of much shipping; we employ many sailors, and among them we employ free colored men—men whom we in Massachusetts acknowledge to be citizens of the United States and citizens of the commonwealth, and entitled to the rights of citizens. These citizens were taken from our vessels when they arrived in South Carolina, and were held in custody till the vessels sailed again. This our citizens complained of, whether justly or unjustly, that it was an encroachment, in the first place, upon the rights of citizens, and, in the next place, that it was a great inconvenience to men engaged in commerce. If I remember rightly, and I think I do, the State of Massachusetts authorized its Governor to propose, at the expense of the State, to some suitable and proper person, who was a citizen of South Carolina, to test the right to hold her citizens in custody in this way, in the courts of the State, or in the courts of the United States. If I remember rightly, that was declined by one or more citizens of South Carolina. Then the mission, to which the honorable Senator refers, was instituted, and the termination of it I believe he has correctly stated.

I wish it to appear that Massachusetts had no aggressive purpose whatever, but simply wished that the judiciary should decide the question existing between them. She wanted nothing more, asked nothing more.

Mr. Clay—Mr. President, I hear with much pleasure this explanation. I have been informed, however, by an eminent citizen of Massachusetts, whose name it is unnecessary to mention—he is not a member of this body—that the motive for the repeal of these laws, or for the passage of these laws, at least one of the motives, was the treatment of Mr. Hoar in Charleston. However, I am glad to hear that it proceeded from another cause, and that is what I conceive to be a misconception of what the true opinion of the judges of the Supreme Court was. When the true exposition of that opinion comes to be known in Massachusetts, I trust that the Legislature of that State will restore the laws facilitating the recovery of fugitive slaves, which she repealed in consequence of that misconception.

Mr. President, I have a great deal yet to say, and I shall, therefore, pass from the consideration of this seventh resolution with the observation, which I believe I have partly made before, that the most stringent provision upon this subject which can be devised will meet with my hearty concurrence and co-operation, in the passage of the bill which is under the consideration of the Senate. The last resolution declares—

"That Congress has no power to prohibit or obstruct the trade in slaves between the slaveholding States; but that the admission or exclusion of slaves brought from one into another of them, depends exclusively upon their own particular laws."

This is a concession, not, I admit, of any real constitutional provision, but a concession from the North to the South of what is understood, I believe, by a great number at the North, to be a constitutional provision. If the resolution should be adopted, take away the decision of the Supreme

Court of the United States on this subject, and there is a great deal, I know, that might be said on both sides, as to the right of Congress to regulate the trade between the States, and, consequently, the trade in slaves between the States; but I think the decision of the Supreme Court has been founded upon correct principles, and I trust it will forever put an end to the question whether Congress has or has not the power to regulate the intercourse and trade in slaves between the different States.

Such, Mr. President, is the series of resolutions which in an earnest and anxious desire to present the olive branch to both parts of this distracted, and at the present moment unhappy country, I have thought it my duty to offer. Of all men upon earth I am the least attached to any productions of my own mind. No man upon earth is more ready than I am to surrender any thing which I have proposed, and to accept in lieu of it any thing that is better; but I put it to the candor of honorable senators on the other side and upon all sides of the House, whether their duty will be performed by simply limiting themselves to objections to any one or to all of the series of resolutions that I have offered. If my plan of peace, and accommodation, and harmony, is not right, present us your plan. Let us see the counter project. Let us see how all the questions that have arisen out of this unhappy subject of slavery can be better settled, more fairly and justly settled to all quarters of the Union, than on the plan proposed in the resolutions which I have offered. Present me such a scheme, and I will hail it with pleasure, and will accept it without the slightest feeling of regret that my own was abandoned. Sir, while I was engaged in anxious consideration upon this subject, the idea of the Missouri Compromise, as it has been termed, came under my review, was considered by me, and finally rejected as in my judgment less worthy of the common acceptance of both parts of this Union than the project which I have offered for your consideration.

Before I enter into a particular examination, however, of that Missouri Compromise, I beg to be allowed to correct a great error which is prevailing, not merely in this Senate, but throughout the whole country, in respect to my agency in the Missouri Compromise, or rather in respect to the line of 36° 30′ which was established in 1820 by an act of Congress. I do not know whether any thing has excited more surprise in my mind, as to the rapidity with which important historical transactions are obliterated and pass from the mind, than when I understood every where that I had been the author of the line of 36° 30′, which was established upon the occasion of the admission of Missouri into the Union. It would take too much time to go over the whole of that important era in the public affairs of the country. I shall not do it, although I have got ample materials before me, derived from a careful examination of the journals of both Houses. I will not occupy your time by going in detail through the whole transaction, but I will content myself with saying that so far from my having presented as a proposition this line of 36° 30′, upon the occasion of the consideration whether Missouri should be admitted into the Union or not, it did not originate in the House of which I was a member.

It originated in this body, as those who will cast their recollection back, and I am sure the honorable senator from Missouri, (Mr. Benton), more correctly than any body else, must bring to his recollection the fact that at the Congress when the proposition was first made to admit Missouri—or rather to allow her to hold a convention and frame a constitution and decide whether she should or should not be admitted into the Union—the bill failed by a disagreement between the two Houses, the House insisting

on and the Senate dissenting from the provisions contained in the ordinance of 1787. The House insisting on the interdiction of slavery, and the Senate rejecting the proposition of the interdiction of slavery, the bill fell through; it did not pass at that session of Congress. At the next session it was renewed, and at the time of its renewal Maine was knocking at our door to be admitted into the Union. In the House there was a majority for the restriction as to slavery in Missouri; in the Senate there was a majority opposed to all restriction. In the Senate, therefore, in order to carry through the Missouri bill, or the provision for her admission—or rather authorizing her to determine the question of her admission—that bill was coupled with the bill for the admission of Maine. They were connected together, and the Senate said to the House, "You want a bill for the admission of Maine passed, but you shall not have it, unless you take along with it a bill for the admission of Missouri also." There was a majority, a very large one, in the Senate, for coupling both together.

Well, sir, the bill went through all the usual stages of disagreement of committees of conference, and there were two committees of conference on the occasion before the matter was finally settled. And it was finally settled to disconnect the two bills—to admit Maine separately, without any connection with Missouri, and to insert in the Missouri bill a clause proposed in the Senate of the United States by Mr. Thomas, Senator from Illinois, restricting slavery north of the line 36° 30′, and leaving it open south of that line, either to admit it or not to admit it. Well, sir, the bill finally passed. The committees of conference of the two Houses recommended the detachment of the two cases, and the passage of the Missouri bill with the clause 36° 30′ in it; and so it passed, so it went to Missouri, so it for a moment quieted the country, by means of the introduction of the clause 36° 30′. You will find, I repeat, sir, if you will take the trouble to look at the journals, that on as many as three or four different occasions Mr. Thomas in every instance presented the proposition of 36° 30′. It was finally agreed to; and I take occasion to say that among those who voted for the 36° 30′ were the majority of the Southern members—my friend from Alabama (Mr. King), in the Senate, Mr. Pinckney, from Maryland, and indeed the majority of the Southern Senators voted in favor of the line 36° 30′; and the majority of the Southern members in the other House, at the head of whom was Mr. Lowndes himself, voted also for that line. I have no doubt I did also; but, as I was Speaker of the House at the time, and the journal does not show how the Speaker votes except in the case of a tie, I was not able to ascertain, by a resort to the records, how I did vote; but I have very little doubt that I voted, in common with my other Southern friends, for the adoption, in a spirit of compromise, it is true, of the line 36° 30′.

Well, sir, so the matter ended in 1820. During that year Missouri held her convention, adopted her constitution, sent her delegates to Congress, seeking to be admitted into the Union; but she had inserted a clause in her constitution containing a prohibition of free people of color from that State. She came here with her constitution containing that prohibition, and immediately the Northern members took exception to it. The flame which had been repressed during the previous session now burst forth with double violence throughout the whole Union. Legislative bodies all got in motion to keep out Missouri, in consequence of her interdiction of free people of color from within her limits. I did not arrive at Congress that session till January, and when I got here I found both bodies completely

paralyzed in consequence of the struggle to exclude Missouri from the Union on account of that prohibition.

Well, sir, I made the first effort in the House to settle it. I asked for a committee of thirteen, and a committee of thirteen was granted to me, representing all the old States of the Union. The committee met. I presented to them a resolution, which was adopted by the committee and reported to the House—not unlike the one to which I will presently call the attention of the Senate—and we should have carried it in the House but for the votes of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia; Mr. Edwards, of North Carolina; and Mr. Burton, of North Carolina—two of the three, I believe, no longer living. These three Southern votes were all cast against the compromise which was prepared by the committee, or rather by myself, as chairman of the committee of thirteen, and defeated it.

Well, sir, in that condition the thing remained for several days. The greatest anxiety pervaded the country—the public mind was unsettled—men were unhappy—there was a large majority of the House then, as I hope and trust there is now a large majority in Congress, in favor of an equitable accommodation or settlement of the question; and the resolution would have been adopted, I believe, but when it came to the vote of yeas and nays, unfortunately then—more unfortunately then, I hope, than now, if there should be occasion for it now—there were few Curtiuses and Leonidases willing to risk themselves for the safety and security of their country. I endeavored to avail myself of that good feeling, as far as I could; and, after a few days had elapsed, I brought forward another proposition; a new one, perfectly unpracticed in this country, either before or since, as far as I know.

I proposed a joint committee of the two houses; that of the House to consist of twenty-three members (the number of the Senate committee I do not recollect), and that this committee should be appointed by ballot; for at that time Mr. Taylor, of New York, was in the chair, and Mr. Taylor was the very man who had first proposed the restriction upon Missouri. He proposed that she should only be admitted on the principle of the ordinance of 1787; I proposed, therefore, that the committee be appointed by ballot. Well, sir, my motion was carried by a large majority; and members came to me from all quarters of the House, and said, "Whom, Mr. Clay, do you want to have with you on the committee?" I made out my list of twenty-three members, and I venture to say that that happened on that occasion which will hardly ever happen again, eighteen of the twenty-three were elected on the first ballot, and the remaining five on my list having the largest number of votes, but not the majority, I moved to dispense with any further balloting, and that these five should be added to the eighteen, thus completing the committee of twenty-three. One or two gentlemen, Mr. Livermore, of New Hampshire, and one or two others, declined to serve on the committee; and, very much to my regret, and somewhat to my annoyance, the lamented Mr. Randolph and another person were placed in their situation—I forget whether done by ballot or by the Speaker—it is enough to say they were put on the committee.

Well, sir, the Senate immediately agreed to the proposition, appointed its committee, and we met in this hall on the Sabbath day, within two or three days of the close of the session, when the whole nation was waiting with breathless anxiety for some final and healing measure upon the distracting subject which occupied our attention. We met here on that day, and, accordingly, the moment we met, Mr. Randolph made a suggestion which I knew would be attended with the greatest embarrassment and dif-

ficulty. He contended that over the two committees of the two houses the chairman of the House committee had a right to preside, and he was about to insist at some length that the two committees should be blended together, and that I should preside over both. I instantly interposed, and said that I did not think that was the correct mode, but that the chairman of the committee of each house should preside over his own committee, and that when the committee of one house matured and adopted a proposition, it should be submitted to the other committee, and if agreed to by them, it should then be reported to the two houses, and its adoption recommended. That course was agreed upon, and Mr. Holmes, I believe, of Maine, presided over the committee of the Senate, and I presided over the committee of the House. I did then, what I have protested I would not do at this session, take too much the lead in the discussion.

I brought forward the proposition which I will refer to presently; and I did more, I took the trouble to ascertain the views of each member of the committee—I polled the committee, if I may use the expression. I said, now, gentlemen, we do not want a proposition carried here by a simple majority and reported to the House, there to be rejected. I am for something practical, something conclusive, something decisive upon this agitating question, and it should be carried by a good majority. How will you vote, Mr. A.? how will you vote, Mr. B.? how will you vote, Mr. C.? and I polled them in that way. Well, sir, to my very great happiness, a sufficient number responded affirmatively, that they would vote for the proposition, to enable me to know that, if they continued to vote that way in the two houses, of which I had not a particle of doubt in the world, the proposition would be carried in the two houses. Accordingly, it having been agreed upon by both committees, and reported to their respective houses, it was finally adopted.

This joint resolution for the admission of Missouri was passed in 1821. (I find I have been furnished with one which was proposed, but not adopted. The right one is contained in the statutes at large; I have seen it there.)

Well, sir, the resolution was finally adopted. I can state, without reading it, what its provisions are. It declares that, if there be any provision in the constitution of Missouri, incompatible with the Constitution of the United States, Missouri shall forbear to enforce the repugnant provisions of her constitution, and that she shall by some solemn and authentic act declare that she will not enforce any provisions of her constitution which are incompatible with the Constitution of the United States; and upon her passage of such a solemn and authentic act, the President of the United States—who was at that time Mr. Monroe—shall make proclamation of the fact; and thereupon, and without any further legislation of Congress, Missouri shall be admitted into the Union.

Now, sir, I want to call your attention to this period of history, and to the transactions which took place during the progress of the discussion upon the resolution.

During the discussion which took place in the House at that time, from day to day, and from night to night—for the discussion frequently ran into the night—we who were for admitting Missouri into the Union said to our brethren from the North, "Why, gentlemen, if there be any provision in the constitution of Missouri which is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, it is a nullity. The Constitution of the United States, by virtue of its own operation—its own self-operation—vacates it. Any tribunal on earth, before which the question may be brought, must pronounce the Constitution of the United States paramount, and must pro-

nounce invalid the repugnant provisions of the constitution of Missouri." Well, sir, the argument was turned, and twisted, and used in every possible variety of form. All was in vain. An inflexible majority stood out to the last against the admission of Missouri; and yet the resolution—

Mr. UNDERWOOD—I have it here.

Mr. CLAY—If you will read it, I shall be obliged to you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD read the resolution as follows:

"RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI INTO THE UNION ON A CERTAIN CONDITION.

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Missouri shall be admitted into this Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, upon the fundamental condition that the fourth clause of the 26th section of the third article of the Constitution, submitted on the part of said State to Congress, shall never be construed to authorize the passage of any law, and that no law shall be passed in conformity thereto, by which any citizen of either of the States of this Union shall be excluded from the enjoyment of any of the privileges and immunities to which such citizen is entitled under the Constitution of the United States: *Provided*, That the Legislature of the said State, by a solemn public act, shall declare the assent of the said State to the said fundamental condition, and shall transmit to the President of the United States, on or before the fourth Monday in November next, an authentic copy of the said act; upon the receipt whereof the President, by proclamation, shall announce the fact; whereupon, and without any further proceeding on the part of Congress, the admission of the said State into the Union shall be considered as complete.

"[Approved March 2, 1822.]"

Mr. CLAY—There is the resolution, sir, and you see it is precisely what I have stated. After all this excitement throughout the country, reaching to such an alarming point that the Union itself was supposed to be in the most imminent peril and danger, the parties were satisfied by the declaration of an incontestable principle of constitutional law, that when the Constitution of a State is violative in its provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the United States is paramount, and the Constitution of the State in that particular is a nullity and void. That was all. They wanted something as a justification, and this appeared, at least, a justification of the course they took. There is a great deal of language there of a high-sounding character—that it shall be a fundamental act, a solemn act, an authentic act; but, after all, when you come to strip it of its verbiage, it is nothing but the announcement of the principle that the Constitution of the United States is paramount over the local Constitution of any one of the States of the Union.

Mr. President, I may draw from that transaction in our history which we are now examining, this moral; that now, as then, if we will only suffer our reason to have its scope and sway, and to still and hush the passion and excitement that has been created by the occasion, the difficulty will be more than half removed, in the settlement, upon just and amicable principles, of any questions which unhappily divide us at this moment.

But, sir, I wish to contrast the plan of accommodation which is proposed by me with that which is offered by the Missouri compromise line being extended to the Pacific Ocean, and to ask of gentlemen from the South,

and gentlemen from the North, too, which is most proper, which most just, and to which there is the least cause of objection?

Now, sir, what was done by the Missouri line? Slavery was positively interdicted north of that line. The question of the admission or exclusion of slavery south of that line was not settled. There was no provision that slavery should be introduced or established south of that line. In point of fact, it existed in all the territory south of the line of 36° 30′, embracing Arkansas and Louisiana. It was not necessary then, it is true, to insert a clause admitting slavery at that time. But, sir, if there is a power to interdict, there is a power to admit; and I put it to gentlemen from the South, are they prepared to be satisfied with the line of 36° 30′, interdicting slavery to the north of it, and giving them no guaranty for the possession of slavery south of that line? The honorable senator from Mississippi told us the other day that he was not prepared to be satisfied with that compromise line. He told us, if I understand him rightly, that nothing short of a positive introduction—

Mr. Foote—Recognition.

Mr. Clay—That nothing short of a positive recognition of slavery south of the line of 36° 30′ would satisfy him. Well, is there any body who believes that you could get twenty votes in this body, or a proportional number in the other House, to a declaration in favor of the recognition of slavery south of the line of 36° 30′? It is impossible. All that you can get, all that you can expect to get, all that was proposed at the last session, was action on the north of the line, and non-action as regards slavery south of that line. It is interdicted on one side, without any corresponding provision for its admission on the other side of the line of 36° 30′.

Now, sir, when I came to consider the subject, and to compare the provisions of the line of 36° 30′—the Missouri compromise line—with the plan which I propose for the accommodation of this question, what said I to myself? Why, if I offer the line of 36° 30′, interdicting slavery north of it, and leaving the question open south of that line, I offer that which is illusory to the South; I offer that which will deceive them, if they suppose that slavery will be introduced south of that line. It is better for them, I said to myself—it is better for the whole South, that there should be non-action on both sides, than that there should be action interdicting slavery on one side, without action for the admission of slavery on the other side of the line. Is it not so? What, then, is gained by the South, if the Missouri line is extended to the Pacific, with an interdiction of slavery north of it? Why, sir, one of the very arguments which have been most often and most seriously urged by the South has been this, that we do not want you to legislate upon the subject at all; you ought not to touch it; you have no power over it. I do not concur, as is well known from what I have said upon this occasion, in this view of the subject. But that is the Southern argument. We do not want you to legislate at all on the subject of slavery; but if you adopt the Missouri line and extend it to the Pacific, and interdict slavery north of that line, you do legislate upon the subject of slavery, and you legislate without a corresponding equivalent of legislation on the subject of slavery south of the line. For, if there be legislation interdicting slavery north of the line, the principle of equality would require that there should be legislation admitting slavery south of the line.

Sir, I have said that I never could vote for it, and I repeat that I never can, and never will vote for it; and no earthly power shall ever make me vote to plant slavery where slavery does not exist. Still, if there be a majority—and there ought to be such a majority—for interdicting slavery

north of the line, there ought to be an equal majority—if equality and justice be done to the South—to admit slavery south of the line. And if there be a majority ready to accomplish both of these purposes, though I can not concur in the action, yet I would be one of the last to create any disturbance, I would be one of the first to acquiesce in such legislation, though it is contrary to my own judgment and my own conscience. I think, then, it would be better to keep the whole of these territories untouched by any legislation by Congress on the subject of slavery, leaving it open, undecided, without any action of Congress in relation to it; that it would be best for the South, and best for all the views which the South has, from time to time, disclosed to us as correspondent with her wishes.

I know it may be said with regard to these ceded territories, as it is said with regard to California, that non-legislation implies the same thing as the exclusion of slavery. That we can not help. That Congress is not reproachable for. If nature has pronounced the doom of slavery upon those territories—if she has declared, by her immutable laws, that slavery can not and shall not be introduced there, whom can you reproach but nature or nature's God? Congress you can not; Congress abstains; Congress is passive; Congress is non-active in regard to the subject of slavery south and north of the line; or rather Congress, according to the plan which proposes to extend no line, leaves the entire theater of these territories untouched by legislative enactment, either to exclude or admit slavery.

Well, sir, I ask again—if you will listen to the voice of calm and dispassionate reason—I ask of any man from the South to rise and tell me if it is not better for his section of the Union that Congress should remain passive, on both sides of any ideal line, than that it should interdict slavery on one side of the line and be passive in regard to it on the other side of the line.

Sir, I am taxing both the physical and intellectual powers which a kind Providence has bestowed upon me, too much—too much by far—though I beg to be permitted, if the Senate will have patience with me, to conclude what I have to say, for I do not desire to trespass another day upon your time and patience, as I am approaching, though I have not yet nearly arrived at the conclusion.

Mr. MANGUM—If the senator will permit me, I will move an adjournment.

Mr. CLAY—No, sir, no; I will conclude. I think I can get on better to-day than I shall be able to do if the subject be postponed.

Sir, this Union is threatened with subversion. I want, Mr. President, to take a very rapid glance at the course of public measures in this Union presently. I want, however, before I do that, to ask the Senate to look back upon the career which this country has run since the adoption of this Constitution down to the present day. Was there ever a nation upon which the sun of heaven has shone that has exhibited so much of prosperity? At the commencement of this Government our population amounted to about four millions; it has now reached upward of twenty millions. Our territory was limited chiefly and principally to the border upon the Atlantic ocean, and that which includes the southern shores of the interior lakes of our country.

Our country now extends from the Northern provinces of Great Britain to the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico on one side, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific on the other side—the largest extent of territory under any Government that exists on the face of the earth, with only two solitary exceptions. Our tonnage, from being nothing, has risen in

magnitude and amount so as to rival that of the nation who has been proudly characterized "the mistress of the ocean." We have gone through many wars—wars, too, with the very nation from whom we broke off in 1776, as weak and feeble colonies, and asserted our independence as a member of the family of nations. And, sir, we came out of that struggle, unequal as it was—armed as she was at all points, in consequence of just having come out of her long struggles with other European nations, and unarmed as we were at all points, in consequence of the habits and nature of our country and its institutions—we came, I say, out of that war without any loss of honor whatever—we emerged from it gloriously.

In every Indian war—and we have been engaged in many of them—our armies have triumphed; and without speaking at all as to the causes of the recent war with Mexico, whether it was right or wrong, and abstaining from any expression of opinion as to the justice or propriety of the war, when once commenced all must admit that, with respect to the gallantry of our armies, the glory of our triumphs, there is no page or pages of history which record more brilliant successes. With respect to one commander of an important portion of our army I need say nothing here; no praise is necessary in behalf of one who has been elevated by the voice of his country to the highest station she could place him in, mainly on account of his glorious military career. And of another, less fortunate in many respects than some other military commanders, I must take the opportunity of saying, that for skill, for science, for strategy, for ability, and daring fighting, for chivalry of individuals and of masses, that portion of the American army which was conducted by the gallant Scott, as the chief commander, stands unrivaled either by the deeds of Cortez himself, or by those of any other commander in ancient or modern times.

Sir, our prosperity is unbounded—nay, Mr. President, I sometimes fear that it is in the wantonness of that prosperity that many of the threatening ills of the moment have arisen. Wild and erratic schemes have sprung up throughout the whole country, some of which have even found their way into legislative halls; and there is a restlessness existing among us which I fear will require the chastisement of Heaven to bring us back to a sense of the immeasurable benefits and blessings which have been bestowed upon us by Providence. At this moment—with the exception of here and there a particular department in the manufacturing business of the country—all is prosperity and peace, and the nation is rich and powerful. Our country has grown to a magnitude, to a power and greatness, such as to command the respect, if it does not awe the apprehensions, of the powers of the earth, with whom we come in contact.

Sir, do I depict with colors too lively the prosperity which has resulted to us from the operations of this Union? Have I exaggerated in any particular her power, her prosperity, or her greatness? And now, sir, let me go a little into detail with respect to sway in the councils of the nation, whether from the North or the South, during the sixty years of unparalleled prosperity that we have enjoyed. During the first twelve years of the administration of the Government Northern counsels rather prevailed; and out of them sprang the Bank of the United States, the assumption of the State debts, bounties to the fisheries, protection to our domestic manufactures—I allude to the act of 1789—neutrality in the wars of Europe, Jay's treaty, the alien and sedition laws, and war with France. I do not say, sir, that these, the leading and prominent measures which were adopted during the administrations of Washington and the elder Adams, were carried exclusively by Northern counsels—they could not have been—but mainly by

the ascendency which Northern counsels had obtained in the affairs of the nation. So, sir, of the later period—for the last fifty years.

I do not mean to say that Southern counsels alone have carried the measures which I am about to enumerate. I know they could not exclusively have carried them, but I say that they have been carried by their preponderating influence, with the co-operation, it is true—the large co-operation in some instances—of the Northern section of the Union. And what are those measures? During that fifty years, or nearly that period, in which Southern counsels have preponderated, the embargo and other commercial restrictions of non-intercourse and non-importation were imposed; war with Great Britain, the Bank of the United States overthrown, protection enlarged and extended to domestic manufactures—I allude to the passage of the act of 1815 or 1816—the Bank of the United States re-established, the same bank put down, re-established by Southern counsels and put down by Southern counsels, Louisiana acquired, Florida bought, Texas annexed, war with Mexico, California and other territories acquired from Mexico by conquest and purchase, protection superseded, and free trade established, Indians removed west of the Mississippi, and fifteen new States admitted into the Union. It is very possible, sir, that in this enumeration I may have omitted some of the important measures which have been adopted during this later period of time—the last fifty years—but these I believe to be the most prominent ones.

Now, sir, I do not deduce from the enumeration of the measures adopted by the one side or the other any just cause of reproach either upon one side or the other; though one side or the other has predominated in the two periods to which I have referred. These measures were, to say the least, the joint work of both parties, and neither of them have any just cause to reproach the other. But, sir, I must say, in all kindness and sincerity, that least of all ought the South to reproach the North, when we look at the long list of measures which, under her sway in the counsels of the nation, have been adopted; when we reflect that even opposite doctrines have been from time to time advanced by her; that the establishment of the Bank of the United States, which was done under the administration of Mr. Madison, met with the co-operation of the South—I do not say the whole South—I do not, when I speak of the South or the North, speak of the entire South or the entire North; I speak of the prominent and larger proportion of Southern and Northern men. It was during Mr. Madison's administration that the Bank of the United States was established. My friend, whose sickness—which I very much deplore—prevents us from having his attendance upon this occasion (Mr. Calhoun), was the chairman of the committee, and carried the measure through Congress. I voted for it with all my heart. Although I had been instrumental with other Southern votes in putting down the Bank of the United States, I changed my opinion and co-operated in the establishment of the Bank of 1816. The same bank was again put down by Southern counsels, with General Jackson at their head, at a later period. Again, with respect to the policy of protection. The South in 1815—I mean the prominent Southern men, the lamented Lowndes, Mr. Calhoun, and others—united in extending a certain measure of protection to domestic manufactures as well as the North.

We find a few years afterward the South interposing most serious objections to this policy, and one member of the South, threatening on that occasion, a dissolution of the Union or separation. Now, sir, let us take another view of the question—and I would remark that all these views are brought forward not in a spirit of reproach, but of conciliation—not to

provoke or exasperate, but to quiet, to produce harmony and repose, if possible. What have been the territorial acquisitions made by this country, and to what interests have they conduced? Florida, where slavery exists, has been introduced; Louisiana, or all the most valuable part of that State —for although there is a large extent of territory north of the line 36° 30′, in point of intrinsic value and importance, I would not give the single State of Louisiana for the whole of it—all Louisiana, I say, with the exception of that which lies north of 36° 30′, including Oregon, to which we obtained title mainly on the ground of its being a part of the acquisition of Louisiana; all Texas; all the territories which have been acquired by the Government of the United States during its sixty years' operation have been slave territories, the theater of slavery, with the exception that I have mentioned of that lying north of the line 36° 30′.

And here, in the case of a war made essentially by the South—growing out of the annexation of Texas, which was a measure proposed by the South in the councils of the country, and which led to the war with Mexico—I do not say all of the South, but the major portion of the South pressed the annexation of Texas upon the country—that measure, as I have said, led to the war with Mexico, and the war with Mexico led to the acquisition of those territories which now constitute the bone of contention between the different members of the Confederacy. And now, sir, for the first time after the three great acquisitions of Texas, Florida, and Louisiana have been made and have redounded to the benefit of the South—now, for the first time, when three territories are attempted to be introduced without the institution of slavery, I put it to the hearts of my countrymen of the South, if it is right to press matters to the disastrous consequences which have been indicated no longer ago than this very morning, on the occasion of the presentation of certain resolutions—even extending to a dissolution of the Union. Mr. President, I can not believe it.

Mr. Underwood—Will the Senator give way for an adjournment?

Mr. Clay—Oh, no; if I do not weary the patience of the Senate, I prefer to go on. I think I can begin to see land. I shall soon come to the conclusion of what I have to say. Such is the Union, and such are the glorious fruits which are now threatened with subversion and destruction. Well, sir, the first question which naturally arises is, supposing the Union to be dissolved for any of the causes or grievances which are complained of, how far will dissolution furnish a remedy for those grievances? If the Union is to be dissolved for any existing cause, it will be because slavery is interdicted or not allowed to be introduced into the ceded territories; or because slavery is threatened to be abolished in the District of Columbia; or because fugitive slaves are not restored, as in my opinion they ought to be, to their masters. These, I believe, would be the causes, if there be any causes which can lead to the dreadful event to which I have referred. Let us suppose the Union dissolved; what remedy does it, in a severed state, furnish for the grievances complained of in its united condition? Will you be able at the South to push slavery into the ceded territory? How are you to do it, supposing the North, or all the States north of the Potomac, in possession of the navy and army of the United States? Can you expect, I say, under these circumstances, that if there is a dissolution of the Union you can carry slavery into California and New Mexico? Sir, you can not dream of such an occurrence.

If it were abolished in the District of Columbia and the Union were dissolved, would the dissolution of the Union restore slavery in the District of Columbia? Is your chance for the recovery of your fugitive slaves safer

in a state of dissolution or of severance of the Union than when in the Union itself? Why, sir, what is the state of the fact? In the Union you lose some slaves and recover others; but here let me revert to a fact which I ought to have noticed before, because it is highly creditable to the courts and juries of the free States. In every instance, as far as my information extends, in which an appeal has been made to the courts of justice to recover penalties from those who have assisted in decoying slaves from their masters—in every instance, as far as I have heard, the court has asserted the rights of the owner, and the jury has promptly returned an adequate verdict on his behalf. Well, sir, there is then some remedy while you are a part of the Union for the recovery of your slaves, and some indemnification for their loss. What would you have, if the Union was severed? Why, then the several parts would be independent of each other—foreign countries—and slaves escaping from one to the other would be like slaves escaping from the United States to Canada. There would be no right of extradition, no right to demand your slaves; no right to appeal to the courts of justice to indemnify you for the loss of your slaves. Where one slave escapes now by running away from his master, hundreds and thousands would escape if the Union were dissevered—I care not how or where you run the line, or whether independent sovereignties be established. Well, sir, finally, will you, in case of a dissolution of the Union, be safer with your slaves within the separated portions of the States than you are now? Mr. President, that they will escape much more frequently from the border States no one will deny.

And, sir, I must take occasion here to say that in my opinion there is no right on the part of any one or more of the States to secede from the Union. War and dissolution of the Union are identical and inevitable, in my opinion. There can be a dissolution of the Union only by consent or by war. Consent no one can anticipate, from any existing state of things, is likely to be given, and war is the only alternative by which a dissolution could be accomplished. If consent were given—if it were possible that we were to be separated by one great line—in less than sixty days after such consent was given war would break out between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding portions of this Union—between the two independent parts into which it would be erected in virtue of the act of separation. In less than sixty days, I believe, our slaves from Kentucky, flocking over in numbers to the other side of the river, would be pursued by their owners. Our hot and ardent spirits would be restrained by no sense of the right which appertains to the independence of the other side of the river, should that be the line of separation. They would pursue their slaves into the adjacent free States; they would be repelled, and the consequence would be that, in less than sixty days, war would be blazing in every part of this now happy and peaceful land.

And, sir, how are you going to separate the States of this Confederacy? In my humble opinion, Mr. President, we should begin with at least three separate Confederacies. There would be a Confederacy of the North, a Confederacy of the Southern Atlantic slaveholding States, and a Confederacy of the valley of the Mississippi. My life upon it, that the vast population which has already concentrated and will concentrate on the head-waters and the tributaries of the Mississippi will never give their consent that the mouth of that river shall be held subject to the power of any foreign State or community whatever. Such, I believe, would be the consequences of a dissolution of the Union, immediately ensuing; but other Confederacies would spring up from time to time, as dissatisfaction and discontent were

disseminated throughout the country—the Confederacy of the lakes, perhaps the Confederacy of New England, or of the middle States. Ah, sir, the vail which covers these sad and disastrous events that lie beyond it, is too thick to be penetrated or lifted by any mortal eye or hand.

Mr. President, I am directly opposed to any purpose of secession or separation. I am for staying within the Union, and defying any portion of this Confederacy to expel me or drive me out of the Union. I am for staying within the Union and fighting for my rights, if necessary, with the sword, within the bounds and under the safeguard of the Union. I am for vindicating those rights, not by being driven out of the Union harshly and unceremoniously by any portion of this Confederacy. Here I am within it, and here I mean to stand and die, as far as my individual wishes or purposes can go—within it to protect my property and defend myself, defying all the power on earth to expel me or drive me from the situation in which I am placed. And would there not be more safety in fighting within the Union than out of it? Suppose your rights to be violated, suppose wrong to be done you, aggressions to be perpetrated upon you, can you not better vindicate them—if you have occasion to resort to the last necessity, the sword, for a restoration of those rights—within, and with the sympathies of a large portion of the population of the Union, than by being without the Union, when a large portion of the population have sympathies adverse to your own? You can vindicate your rights within the Union better than if expelled from the Union, and driven from it without ceremony and without authority.

Sir, I have said that I thought there was no right on the part of one or more States to secede from the Union. I think so. The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity. And every State that then came into the Union, and every State that has since come into the Union, came into it binding itself, by indissoluble bands, to remain within the Union itself, and to remain within it by its posterity forever. Like another of the sacred connections, in private life, it is a marriage which no human authority can dissolve or divorce the parties from. And if I may be allowed to refer to some examples in private life, let me say to the North and to the South, what husband and wife say to each other. We have mutual faults; neither of us is perfect; nothing in the form of humanity is perfect; let us, then, be kind to each other—forbearing, forgiving each other's faults—and above all, let us live in happiness and peace together.

Mr. President, I have said, what I solemnly believe, that dissolution of the Union and war are identical and inevitable; and they are convertible terms; and such a war as it would be, following a dissolution of the Union! Sir, we may search the pages of history, and none so ferocious, so bloody, so implacable, so exterminating—not even the wars of Greece, including those of the Commoners of England and the revolutions of France—none, none of them all would rage with such violence, or be characterized with such bloodshed and enormities as would the war which must succeed, if that event ever happens, the dissolution of the Union. And what would be its termination? Standing armies, and navies, to an extent stretching the revenues of each portion of the dissevered members, would take place. An exterminating war would follow—not, sir, a war of two or three years' duration, but a war of interminable duration—and exterminating wars would ensue, until, after the struggles and exhaustion of both parties, some Philip or Alexander, some Cæsar or Napoleon, would arise and cut the

Gordian knot, and solve the problem of the capacity of man for self-government, and crush the liberties of both the severed portions of this common empire. Can you doubt it?

Look at all history—consult her pages, ancient or modern—look at human nature; look at the contest in which you would be engaged in the supposition of war following upon the dissolution of the Union, such as I have suggested; and I ask you if it is possible for you to doubt that the final disposition of the whole would be some despot treading down the liberties of the people—the final result would be the extinction of this last and glorious light which is leading all mankind, who are gazing upon it, in the hope and anxious expectation that the liberty which prevails here will sooner or later be diffused throughout the whole of the civilized world. Sir, can you lightly contemplate these consequences? Can you yield yourself to the tyranny of passion, amid dangers which I have depicted in colors far too tame of what the result would be if that direful event to which I have referred should ever occur? Sir, I implore gentlemen, I adjure them, whether from the South or the North, by all that they hold dear in this world—by all their love of liberty—by all their veneration for their ancestors—by all their regard for posterity—by all their gratitude to Him who has bestowed on them such unnumbered and countless blessings—by all the duties which they owe to mankind—and by all the duties which they owe to themselves, to pause, solemnly to pause at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and dangerous leap be taken into the yawning abyss below, from which none who ever take it shall return in safety.

Finally, Mr. President, and in conclusion, I implore, as the best blessing which Heaven can bestow upon me, upon earth, that if the direful event of the dissolution of this Union is to happen, I shall not survive to behold the sad and heart-rending spectacle.

NOTE B.—Page 153.

MR. CLAY TO RICHARD PINDELL.

New Orleans, February 17th, 1849.

My Dear Sir—Inclosed I transmit the letter which I promised before I left home, on the subject of Emancipation. It has been prepared under very unfavorable circumstances, while I have been suffering from the effects of a violent fall, which disabled me for a time from walking or writing. This is the first and only draught of the letter. I wish it published in the Observer and Reporter, and as I desire it to be correctly published, if you can not attend to the revisal of the proof sheets, I wish you would ask Judge Trotter to do me that favor. I do not know that James has returned home.

You will see from the concluding paragraphs of my letter that I have no confidence in any hopes of success. But notwithstanding I think I am under some obligation to give publicity to my opinions.

MR. CLAY TO RICHARD PINDELL.

New Orleans, February 17th, 1849.

Dear Sir—Prior to my departure from home in December last, in behalf of yourself and other friends, you obtained from me a promise to make a public exposition of my views and opinions upon a grave and important question which, it was then anticipated, would be much debated and considered by the people of Kentucky, during this year, in consequence of the approaching Convention, summoned to amend their present Constitution. I was not entirely well when I left home, and owing to that cause, and my confinement several weeks, during my sojourn in this city, from the effects of an accident which befell me, I have been delayed in the fulfillment of my promise, which I now proceed to execute.

The question, to which I allude, is whether African slavery, as it now exists in Kentucky, shall be left to a perpetual or indefinite continuance, or some provision shall be made in the new Constitution, for its gradual and ultimate extinction?

A few general observations will suffice my present purpose, without entering on the whole subject of slavery, under all its bearings and in every aspect of it. I am aware that there are respectable persons who believe that slavery is a blessing, that the institution ought to exist in every well organized society, and that it is even favorable to the preservation of liberty. Happily, the number who entertain these extravagant opinions is not very great, and the time would be uselessly occupied in an elaborate refutation of them. I would, however, remark that if slavery be promotive of these alleged benefits, the principle, on which it is maintained, would require

that one portion of the whole race should be reduced to bondage to serve another portion of the same race, when black subjects of slavery could not be obtained; and that in Africa, where they may entertain as great a preference for their color as we do for ours, they would be justified in reducing the white race to slavery, in order to secure the blessings which that state is said to diffuse.

An argument in support of reducing the African race to slavery, is sometimes derived from their alleged intellectual inferiority to the white races; but, if this argument be founded on fact (as it may be, but which I shall not now examine), it would prove entirely too much. It would prove that any white nation which had made greater advances in civilization, knowledge and wisdom than another white nation, would have a right to reduce the latter to a state of bondage. Nay, further, if the principle of subjugation, founded upon intellectual superiority, be true, and be applicable to races and to nations, what is to prevent its being applied to individuals? And then the wisest man in the world would have a right to make slaves of all the rest of mankind!

If indeed we possess this intellectual superiority, profoundly grateful and thankful to HIM who has bestowed it, we ought to fulfill all the obligations and duties which it imposes; and these would require us not to subjugate or deal unjustly by our fellow men who are less blessed than we are, but to instruct, to improve, and to enlighten them.

A vast majority of the people of the United States, in every section of them, I believe, regret the introduction of slavery into the colonies, under the authority of our British ancestors, lament that a simple slave treads our soil, deplore the necessity of the continuance of slavery in any of the States, regard the institution as a great evil to both races, and would rejoice in the adoption of any safe, just, and practicable plan for the removal of all slaves from among us. Hitherto no such satisfactory plan has been presented. When, on the occasion of the formation of the present Constitution of Kentucky, in 1799, the question of the gradual emancipation of slavery in that State was agitated, its friends had to encounter a great obstacle, in the fact that there then existed no established colony, to which they could be transported. Now, by the successful establishment of flourishing colonies on the western coast of Africa, that difficulty has been obviated. And I confess that, without indulging in any undue feelings of superstition, it does seem to me that it may have been among the dispensations of Providence to permit the wrongs, under which Africa has suffered, to be inflicted, that her children might be returned to their original home, civilized, embued with the benign spirit of Christianity, and prepared ultimately to redeem that great continent from barbarism and idolatry.

Without undertaking to judge for any other State, it was my opinion in 1799 that Kentucky was in a condition to admit of the gradual emancipation of her slaves; and how deeply do I lament that a system, with that object, had not been then established! If it had been, the State would now be nearly rid of all slaves. My opinion has never changed, and I have frequently publicly expressed it. I should be most happy if what was impracticable at that epoch could now be accomplished.

After full and deliberate consideration of the subject, it appears to me that three principles should regulate the establishment of a system of gradual emancipation. The first is, that it should be slow in its operation, cautious, and gradual, so as to occasion no convulsion, nor any rash or sudden disturbance, in the existing habits of society. Secondly, that, as an indispensable condition, the emancipated slaves should be removed from

the State to some colony. And, thirdly, that the expenses of their transportation to such colony, including an outfit for six months after their arrival at it, should be defrayed by a fund to be raised from the labor of each freed slave.

1. Nothing could be more unwise than the immediate liberation of all the slaves in the State, comprehending both sexes and all ages, from that of tender infancy to extreme old age. It would lead to the most frightful disorders and the most fearful and fatal consequences. Any great change in the condition of society should be marked by extreme care and circumspection. The introduction of slaves into the colonies was an operation of many years' duration; and the work of their removal from the United States can only he effected after the lapse of a great length of time.

I think that a period should be fixed when all born after it should be free at a specified age, all born before it remaining slaves for life. That period I would suggest should be 1855, or even 1860; for on this and other arrangements of the system, if adopted, I incline to a liberal margin, so as to obviate as many objections, and to unite as many opinions as possible. Whether the commencement of the operation of the system be a little earlier or later, is not so important as that a day should be permanently *fixed*, from which we could look forward, with confidence, to the final termination of slavery, within the limits of the Commonwealth.

Whatever may be the day fixed, whether 1855, or 1860, or any other day, all born after it, I suggest, should be free at the age of twenty-five, but be liable afterward to be hired out, under the authority of the State, for a term not exceeding three years, in order to raise a sum sufficient to pay the expenses of the transportation to the colony, and to provide them an outfit for six months after their arrival there.

If the descendants of those who were themselves to be free, at the age of twenty-five, were also to be considered as slaves until they attained the same age, and this rule were continued indefinitely as to time, it is manifest that slavery would be perpetuated instead of being terminated. To guard against this consequence, provision might be made that the offspring of those who were to be free at twenty-five, should be free from their birth, but upon the condition that they should be apprenticed until they were twenty-one, and be also afterward liable to be hired out, a period not exceeding three years, for the purpose of raising funds to meet their expenses to the colony and their subsistence for the first six months.

The Pennsylvania system of emancipation fixed the period of twenty-eight for the liberation of the slaves, and provided, or her courts have since interpreted the system to mean, that the issue of all who were to be free at the limited age, were from their birth free. The Pennsylvania system made no provision for colonization.

Until the commencement of the system, which I am endeavoring to sketch, I think all the legal rights of the proprietors of slaves, in their fullest extent, ought to remain unimpaired and unrestricted. Consequently they would have the right to sell, devise, or remove them from the State, and, in the latter case, without their offspring being entitled to the benefit of emancipation, for which the system provides.

2d. The colonization of the free blacks, as they successively arrive, from year to year, at the age entitling them to freedom, I consider a condition absolutely indispensable. Without it, I should be utterly opposed to any scheme of emancipation. One hundred and ninety odd thousand blacks, composing about one fourth of the entire population of the State, with their descendants, could never live in peace, harmony, and equality with

the residue of the population. The color, passions, and prejudices would forever prevent the two races from living together in a state of cordial union. Social, moral and political degradation would be the inevitable lot of the colored race. Even in the free States (I use the terms free and slave States not in any sense derogatory from one class, or implying any superiority in the other, but for the sake of brevity), that is their present condition. In some of the free States the penal legislation against the people of color is quite as severe, if not harsher, than it is in some of the slave States. As nowhere in the United States are amalgamation and equality between the two races possible, it is better that there should be a separation, and that the African descendants should be returned to the native land of their fathers.

It will have been seen that the plan I have suggested proposes the annual transportation of all born after a specified day, upon their arrival at the prescribed age, to the colony which may be selected for their destination; and, that this process of transportation is to be continued until the separation of the two races is completed. If the emancipated slaves were to remain in Kentucky until they attained the age of twenty-eight, it would be about thirty-four years before the first annual transportation began, if the system commences in 1855, and about thirty-nine years, if its operation begins in 1860.

What the number thus to be annually transported would be, can not be precisely ascertained. I observe it stated by the auditor that the increase of slaves in Kentucky last year was between three and four thousand. But as that statement was made upon a comparison of the aggregate number of all the slaves in the State, without regard to births, it does not, I presume, exhibit truly the *natural* increase, which was probably larger. The aggregate was affected by the introduction and still more by the exportation of slaves. I suppose that there would not be less, probably more, than five thousand to be transported the first year of the operation of the system; but, after it should be in progress some years, there would be a constant diminution of the number.

Would it be practicable annually to transport five thousand persons from Kentucky? There can not be a doubt of it, or even a much larger number. We receive from Europe annually emigrants to an amount exceeding two hundred and fifty thousand, at a cost for the passage of about ten dollars per head, and they embark at European ports more distant from the United States than the western coast of Africa. It is true that the commercial marine, employed between Europe and the United States affords facilities, in the transportation of emigrants, at that low rate, which that engaged in the commerce between Liberia and this country does not now supply; but that commerce is increasing, and by the time the proposed system, if adopted, would go into operation, it will have greatly augmented. If there were a certainty of the annual transportation of not less than five thousand persons to Africa, it would create a demand for transports, and the spirit of competition would, I have no doubt, greatly diminish the present cost of the passage. That cost has been stated, upon good authority, to be at present fifty dollars per head, including the passage and six months' outfit after the arrival of the emigrant in Africa. Whatever may be the cost, and whatever the number to be transported, the fund to be raised by the hire of the liberated slave, for a period not exceeding three years, will be amply sufficient. The annual hire, on the average, may be estimated at fifty dollars, or one hundred and fifty for the whole term.

Colonization will be attended with the painful effect of the separation of

the colonists from their parents, and in some instances from their children but from the latter it will be only temporary, as they will follow and be again reunited. Their separation from their parents will not be until after they have attained a mature age, nor greater than voluntarily takes place with emigrants from Europe, who leave their parents behind. It will be far less distressing than what frequently occurs in the state of slavery, and will be attended with the animating encouragement that the colonists are transferred from a land of bondage and degradation, for them, to a land of liberty and equality.

And 3d. The expense of transporting the liberated slave to the colony, and of maintaining him there for six months, I think, ought to be provided for by a fund derived from his labor, in the manner already indicated. He is the party most benefited by emancipation. It would not be right to subject the non-slaveholder to any part of that expense; and the slaveholder will have made sufficient sacrifices, without being exclusively burdened with taxes to raise that fund. The emancipated slaves could be hired out for the time proposed, by the Sheriff or other public agent, in each county, who should be subject to a strict accountability. And it would be requisite that there should be kept a register of all births of children of color, after the day fixed for the commencement of the system, enforced by appropriate sanctions. It would be a very desirable regulation of law to have the births, deaths, and marriages of the whole population of the State registered and preserved, as is done in most well governed States.

Among other considerations which unite in recommending to the State of Kentucky a system for the gradual abolition of slavery, is that arising out of her exposed condition, affording great facilities to the escape of her slaves into the free States and into Canada. She does not enjoy the security which some of the slave States have, by being covered in depth by two or three slave States, intervening between them and free States. She has a greater length of border on free States than any other slave State in the Union. That border is the Ohio river, extending from the mouth of Big Sandy to the mouth of the Ohio, a distance of near six hundred miles, separating her from the already powerful and growing States of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Vast numbers of slaves have fled from most of the counties in Kentucky, from the mouth of the Big Sandy to the mouth of the Miami, and the evil has increased and is increasing. Attempts to recover the fugitives lead to the most painful and irritating collisions. Hitherto countenance and assistance to the fugitives have been chiefly afforded by persons in the State of Ohio; but it is to be apprehended, from the progressive opposition to slavery that, in process of time, similar facilities to the escape of slaves will be found in the States of Indiana and Illinois. By means of railroads, Canada can be reached from Cincinnati in a little more than twenty-four hours.

In the event of a civil war breaking out, or in the more direful event of a dissolution of the Union, in consequence of the existence of slavery, Kentucky would become the theater and bear the brunt of the war. She would doubtless defend herself with her known valor and gallantry; but the superiority of the numbers by which she would be opposed would lay waste and devastate her fair fields. Her sister slave States would fly to her succor; but, even if they should be successful in the unequal conflict, she never could obtain any indemnity for the inevitable ravages of the war.

It may be urged that we ought not, by the gradual abolition of slavery, to separate ourselves from the other slave States, but continue to share with them in all their future fortunes. The power of each slave State, within its

limits, over the institution of slavery, is absolute, supreme and exclusive—exclusive of that of Congress or that of any other State. The government of each slave State is bound by the highest and most solemn obligations to dispose of the question of slavery, so as best to promote the peace, happiness and prosperity of the people of the State. Kentucky being essentially a farming State, slave-labor is less profitable. If in most of the other slave States they find that labor more profitable, in the culture of the staples of cotton and sugar, they may perceive a reason in that fact for continuing slavery, which can not be expected should control the judgment of Kentucky as to what may be fitting and proper for her interests. If she should abolish slavery, it would be her duty, and I trust that she would be as ready as she now is, to defend the slave States in the enjoyment of all their lawful and constitutional rights. Her power, political and physical, would be greatly increased; for the one hundred and ninety odd thousand slaves and their descendants, would be gradually superseded by an equal number of white inhabitants, who would be estimated *per capita*, and not by the federal rule of three fifths prescribed for the colored race in the Constitution of the United States.

I have thus, without reserve, freely expressed my opinion and presented my views. The interesting subject of which I have treated would have admitted of much enlargement; but I have desired to consult brevity. The plan which I have proposed will hardly be accused of being too early in its commencement or too rapid in its operation. It will be more likely to meet with contrary reproaches. If adopted, it is to begin thirty-four or thirty-nine years from the time of its adoption, as the one period or the other shall be selected for its commencement. How long a time it will take to remove all the colored race from the State, by the annual transportation of each year's natural increase, can not be exactly ascertained. After the system may have been in operation some years, I think it probable, from the manifest benefits that would flow from it, from the diminished value of slave labor, and from the humanity and benevolence of private individuals prompting a liberation of their slaves and their transportation, a general disposition would exist to accelerate and complete the work of colonization.

That the system will be attended with some sacrifices on the part of slaveholders, which are to be regretted, need not be denied. What great and beneficent enterprise was ever accomplished without risk and sacrifice? But these sacrifices are distant, contingent and inconsiderable. Assuming the year 1860 for the commencement of the system, all slaves born prior to that time would remain such during their lives, and the present loss of the slaveholder would be only the difference in value of a female slave whose offspring, if she had any, born after the first day of January, 1860, should be free at the age of twenty-five or should be slaves for life. In the mean time, if the right to remove or sell the slave out of the State, should be exercised, that trifling loss would not be incurred. The slaveholder, after the commencement of the system, would lose the difference in value between slaves for life and slaves until the age of twenty-five. He might also incur some inconsiderable expense in rearing from their birth the issue of those who were to be free at twenty-five, until they were old enough to be apprenticed out; but as it is probable that they would be most generally bound to him, he would receive some indemnity from their services until they attained their majority.

Most of the evils, losses and misfortunes of human life have some compensation or alleviation. The slaveholder is generally a landholder, and I

am persuaded that he would find in the augmented value of his land, some, if not full indemnity for losses arising to him from emancipation and colonization. He would also liberally share in the general benefits, accruing to the whole State, from the extinction of slavery. These have been so often and so fully stated that I will not, nor is it necessary to, dwell upon them extensively. They can be summed up in a few words. We shall remove from among us the contaminating influences of a servile and degraded race of different color; we shall enjoy the proud and conscious satisfaction of placing that race where they can enjoy the great blessings of liberty, and sivil, political and social equality; we shall acquire the advantage of the diligence, the fidelity, and the constancy of free labor instead of the carelessness, the infidelity, and the unsteadiness of slave labor; we shall elevate the character of white labor, and elevate the social condition of the white laborer; augment the value of our lands, improve the agriculture of the State, attract capital from abroad to all the pursuits of commerce, manufactures and agriculture; redress, as far and as fast as we safely and prudently can, any wrongs which the descendants of Africa have suffered at our hands, and we should demonstrate the sincerity with which we pay indiscriminate homage to the great cause of the liberty of the human race.

Kentucky enjoys high respect and honorable consideration throughout the Union and throughout the civilized world; but, in my humble opinion, no title which she has to the esteem and admiration of mankind, no deeds of her former glory would equal in greatness and grandeur, that of being the pioneer State in removing from her soil every trace of human slavery, and in establishing the descendants of Africa, within her jurisdiction, in the native land of their forefathers.

I have thus executed the promise I made, alluded to in the commencement of this letter, and I hope that I have done it calmly, free from intemperance, and so as to wound the sensibilities of none. I sincerely hope that the question may be considered and decided without the influence of party or passion. I should be most happy to have the good fortune of coinciding in opinion with the majority of the people of Kentucky; but, if there be a majority opposed to all schemes of gradual emancipation, however much I may regret it, my duty will be to bow in submission to their will. If it be perfectly certain and manifest that such a majority exists, I should think it better not to agitate the question at all, since that, in that case, it would be useless, and might exercise a pernicious collateral influence upon the fair consideration of other amendments which may be proposed to our Constitution. If there be a majority of the people of Kentucky, at this time, adverse to touching the institution of slavery, as it now exists, we, who had thought and wished otherwise, can only indulge the hope that at some future time, under better auspices and with the blessing of Providence, the cause which we have so much at heart, may be attended with better success.

In any event, I shall have the satisfaction of having performed a duty to the State, to the subject, and to myself, by placing my sentiments permanently upon record.

NOTE C.—Page 154.

February 20, 1850. In Senate, Mr. Clay, in the debate on his Compromise resolutions, said:

"From the earliest moment when I could consider the institution of slavery, I have held, and I have said, from that day down to the present, again and again, and I shall go to the grave with the opinion, that it is an evil, a social and political evil, and that it is a wrong as it respects those who are subject to the institution of slavery. These are my opinions. I quarrel with no man for holding contrary opinions; and it is perfectly true, that, in my own State, about this time last year, I addressed a letter to a friend, in which I suggested these opinions, and sketched out what appeared to me might be a practicable plan for the gradual emancipation of slavery in Kentucky. That letter I chose to put on record I knew at the moment that I wrote that letter at New Orleans, as well as I know at this moment, that a majority of the people of Kentucky would not adopt my scheme, or probably any project whatever of gradual emancipation. Perfectly well did I know it; but I was anxious that, if any one of my posterity, or any human being who comes after me, should have occasion to look into my sentiments, and ascertain what they were on this great institution of slavery, to put them on record then; and ineffectual as I saw the project would be, I felt it was a duty which I owed to myself, to truth, to my country, and to my God, to record my sentiments. The State of Kentucky has decided as I anticipated she would do. I regret it; but I acquiesce in her decision."

As will be seen, the above extract is a pertinent *addendum* to the preceding letter on the gradual abolition of slavery in the State of Kentucky, and it expresses Mr. Clay's feelings on the evils of slavery in the strongest manner, declaring with great solemnity, that his letter to Mr. Pindell, under Note B, was "What he owed to himself, to truth, to his country, and to his God."

NOTE D.—Page 181.

The following extracts from a few of Mr. Clay's speeches, which were delivered from January 29, 1850, to the 31st of July, are intended to verify and illustrate the history given in chapters VI., VII., VIII., and IX., touching the Compromise of 1850. Some of the extracts, as will be seen, are from the Committee of Thirteen. We doubt not they will be read with interest, in connection with those chapters, by all who desire to become acquainted with the details of that last great labor of the great American statesman. The topic of one extract may be found totally disconnected with the preceding or succeeding one; but each of them is connected with some portion of one of the chapters above referred to, as a verification or illustration.

Mr. Clay's Resolutions of 1838. January 29, 1850, Mr. Clay said:

"As I do not choose that what I consider a mistaken representation of my sentiments in 1838, should go out, I will simply state what they were then, and what they are now. Sir, there is not a word in that resolution [of 1838] that implies that any faith was pledged to the States other than to Virginia and to Maryland, that Congress would not abolish slavery in this District. The resolution says, that the agitation of the question of abolition by people living out of the District, is, in its tendency, dangerous to the slave States; and that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would be just cause of alarm, not merely to Virginia and Maryland, but to all the slave States; and why? What was it that abolition proposed? It was abolition without compensation. The assertion, therefore, of opinion, which I made then, was, that, by the nature and objects of the cession of the ten miles square by Virginia and Maryland, it could not have been anticipated by either of these States that the power conveyed to the General Government over the ten miles square, would be so exercised as to abolish slavery within those States respectively; and further, that slavery continuing in Virginia and Maryland, if such an aboli-

tion were to take place within the District of Columbia, and without compensation to the slaveholder, it would be a just cause of alarm to the owners of that description of property, wherever situated. Now, sir, that was my doctrine in 1838, and that is my doctrine still.

"Sir, I do not regard the mere phraseology of the resolutions [which Mr. Clay had introduced that day]. I will not substitute the word 'unconstitutional' for the word 'inexpedient;' for I do not believe it to be unconstitutional [to abolish slavery in the District]. I can not believe it. If the power to legislate in all cases whatever be granted to Congress, does it not comprehend the power to legislate on the subject of slavery? The power is there. But there is an implied faith connected with the power, resulting from the circumstances to which I have referred, imposing on Congress the obligation not to exercise the power, so long as slavery existed in Virginia and Maryland. And now that Virginia has taken back her part of the cession, such abolition may not take place without the consent of Maryland, nor without compensation, as I contended in 1838."

The Compromise Line of 1820.

"I am extremely sorry to hear the senator from Mississippi [Mr Davis] say, that he requires not only the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, but that he also requires a positive provision for the admission of slavery south of that line. This last he knows is impossible. And now, sir, coming from a slave State, as I do, I owe it to myself, I owe it to truth, I owe it to the subject, to say, that no earthly power could induce me to vote for a specific measure for the introduction of slavery where it had not before existed, either South or North of that line. * * * The honorable senator from Virginia has expressed the opinion that slavery exists in those Territories [acquired from Mexico]. But I believe that slavery nowhere exists within any portion of those Territories. I say, sir, in my place, that I consider it much better for the South, that the whole subject should be open on both sides of an imaginary line—for instance, the line of 36° 30′, than that slavery should be interdicted positively north of 36° 30′, with freedom to introduce or establish slavery south of that line." * * *

Plan of Treating the Resolutions.

"My purpose [in these resolutions] is, that they shall be taken up, duly considered, and decided upon; and if any of them are decided upon affirmatively, that they be referred to some appropriate committee, with instructions to bring in a bill in pursuance of such expressions of the opinion of the Senate. That, as I understand, is the parliamentary course of legislation throughout the world, wherever parliaments exist. They are not, as the worthy senator from Texas supposes, mere abstract propositions. No such thing. I intended them as practical, sober propositions, with a view to subsequent action."

THE COMMITTEE OF THIRTEEN. March 13, Mr. Clay said:

"In regard to the constitution of the Committee [of Thirteen], if this proposition should be adopted, as the senator from Mississippi proposes, I beg leave to say a word or two. Sir, I had nothing to do with it. I was not consulted in relation to any member whatever to be placed upon that Committee. The senator from Mississippi, in that kind and friendly manner in which intercourse with him has generally been carried on, mentioned the purpose which he had in view in proposing the appointment of a Committee of Thirteen, in imitation of what was done in a most memorable epoch of the country [the Missouri Compromise], and asked me if I would concur in such a measure. I stated to him what I wish now to say to the Senate, that I considered an amicable adjustment of all the questions which unfortunately divide and agitate the country, as of such great and paramount importance, that I will vote for any proposition, coming from any quarter, which looks to or proposes such an adjustment. That is the object which, I understand, the honorable member from Mississippi proposes to accomplish. I am, I must add, at the same time, however, far less sanguine than he is, that such a committee will be able to present to the Senate a scheme of adjustment of this unhappy subject, which will command the majority. Still, I would make the experiment, and I would make experiments day after day, and night after night, if necessary, to accomplish the great and patriotic object to which I refer. With regard to the formation of the Committee, I dare say the honorable senator may have consulted with other gentlemen, but I certainly was not consulted. Upon the other memorable occasion to which I have referred, I made out the Committee of Thirteen, and put it into the hands of the Speaker, and he appointed every member I proposed. In reference to the second committee, the joint committee on the part of the House and an appropriate number on the part of the Senate—from all sides of the House, members came flocking around me, begging that I would make out a list of a committee to be balloted for by the House. I accordingly turned my attention to the subject, and determined on the twenty-three names, and caused them to be distributed by the officers throughout the House; and eighteen were elected at the first ballot, and the other five, who had the highest number, each having a plurality, were, on my motion, elected, further balloting being dispensed with."

MR. CLAY'S HEALTH.

When Mr. Clay rose to speak, on the 5th of April, he said:

"The condition of my health scarcely justifies my being here at all; but such is the deep, inextinguishable anxiety I feel on this subject, that, even at the risk of injury to my health, I feel an irrepressible inclination always to be at my post."

He proceeded to say:

"Mr. President, no one can deplore more than I do, what is the manifest state of feeling and relation of parties at this time, in both Houses of Congress. It is in a great measure the result of those unhappy agitations which prevail in Congress and throughout the country. Those agitations have engendered feelings of distrust of the honor and fidelity with which, after one portion of the common subject has been disposed of, the other portions of the same subject may be disposed of. Sir, I do not partake of these feelings to the extent which, I apprehend, some others may. From the first moment of my entrance into this House, until now, my anxious desire has been to see these great questions amicably adjusted, and to see harmony and concord, and fraternal affection once more restored to this divided, and for the moment, unhappy country. And, sir, acting upon this feeling, I have favored any proposition which has been offered, which looked to such a termination of the subject as I have described. Less confident, perhaps, than others may be, in regard to particular modes of adjusting the questions, I have been for embracing them all—no matter from what quarter they might come—which looked toward restoring union and harmony."

Parliamentary Tactics.

Mr. Clay was at first in favor of admitting California by itself; but when he saw the trouble likely to arise from the Wilmot Proviso and parliamentary tactics, in acting on the Territorial Governments separately, he was then in favor of putting California in the same bill with the Territories.

On the 8th of April, he said:

"We know that there are great difficulties with reference to the passage of Territorial governments unconnected with the Wilmot Proviso. * * * I alluded, the other day, to other considerations not likely to happen in this House, but which have happened, and may again happen, in the other House of Congress. I alluded to what we heard said—with most decided disapprobation on my part—I heard, that, if it was attempted to force on the minority of the other House a measure unacceptable to it, without its association with other objects in view, that minority would resort, in resistance of it, not I trust to acts of violence, but to those parliamentary rules and modes of proceeding, of which we have before had instances, in this country, and which I myself witnessed forty years ago, in a most remarkable degree, in the House of Representatives, and which we know some consider lawful at any time to be employed. For myself, I differ, perhaps, from most members of this body, or of any deliberative body, on this subject. I am for the trial of mind against mind, of argument against argument, of reason against reason; and when, after such employment of our intellectual faculties, I find myself in the minority, I am for

submitting to the act of the majority. I am not for resorting to adjournments, calls for the yeas and nays, and other dilatory proceedings, in order to delay that which, if the Constitution has full and fair operation, must inevitably take place. But while this is my judgment of what is proper in deliberative bodies, other gentlemen entertain different opinions. They think it fair to employ all the parliamentary means that are vested in them by the Constitution, or by the rules which regulate the body to which they belong, to defeat, impede, or delay, to any extent, the passage of the measure which they consider odious. I repeat, sir, I do not justify such a course. But we must take man as he is, with all his weaknesses and infirmities, and we can never expect to make him as we could wish him to be."

Mr. Clay against Instructions to the Committee.

April 17th, Mr. Clay said:

"There have been some seventeen resolutions proposed by the senator from Tennessee and myself to the Senate. The Senate has expressed no opinion upon any one of them. * * * The proposition is to refer all these subjects to a committee, and my amendment is, that I will not say to that committee beforehand, how they are to act upon this or that subject."

A Little Affair with Mr. Benton.

"The honorable senator [Mr. Benton] has spoken of a caucus," said Mr. Clay, "and intimated that there was one. On what authority does he make such an assertion? I pronounce it a mistake—an absolute and entire mistake. There has been no caucus, that I know of, although, God knows, I would attend a caucus of any and of every body, to settle this most unhappy question, which is now distracting the country—and I would attend it without any feelings of reproach, from whatever quarter it might be hurled. The honorable senator speaks of his rights. Yes, sir; and other senators have their rights also; and other senators are just as well prepared to assert their rights, as the senator from Missouri. And, sir, the Senate has its rights. Now, sir, I put it to the Senate and to the country, what has been the progress of this matter? The senator from Missouri proposes an amendment embracing four propositions, and as a sort of menace, I suppose, he shells out eight or ten others, and speaks of having others still in reserve! Well, my dear sir—Mr. President, I mean—has not this body a right to protect itself? Has not a majority of this Senate a right to say whether they will or will not create a Committee without any instructions? * * * I say, sir, that a majority of the Senate ought to have this power. I care not by what name you call it. The previous question! Ah, sir, not many years will elapse before you will find the indispensable necessity of terminating a useless and unnecessary debate in this House. In my reflections upon the past, in respect to my parliament-

ary career—my congressional career—I look back to no part of it with more satisfaction than the introduction of that previous question in the other wing of this Capitol. * * * Let my amendment [for no instructions to the committee] be adopted, and then let the senator [Mr. Benton] offer his other instructions, from one to ninety-nine, if he pleases, and we will see whether the question of order will not silence them all."

Mr. Clay Opposed to the Rejection of Abolition Petitions.

Numerous Abolition Petitions having been sent to the Senate, and while a motion was pending to reject them, Mr. Clay said, on the 18th of April:

"Sir, I congratulate you, I congratulate the nation, I congratulate mankind, for the prospect that now opens for a final and amicable settlement of this question. I believe such a settlement will be made after the occurrences in this body this week, and after what we know of the patriotic disposition of the majority in the other House. Now, sir, when these questions are settled, I want no man to have it in his power to go home and make such speeches as we have heard here. I want no man to go home and endeavor to excite the people, by telling them, 'Your petitions were treated with the utmost indignity!' I hope, therefore, that these petitions will be taken up, and referred to the Committee."

Report of the Committee of Thirteen.

On the 8th of May, Mr. Clay brought in the report of the Committee of Thirteen, of which the following are extracts:

"In considering the question of the admission of California, as a State, into the Union, a majority of the Committee conceive, that any irregularity by which that State was organized, without the previous authority of an act of Congress, ought to be overlooked, in consideration of the omission by Congress to establish any territorial government for the people of California, and the consequent necessity which they were under to create a government for themselves best adapted to their own wants. There are various instances, prior to the case of California, of the admission of new States into the Union, without any previous authorization by Congress. The sole condition required by the Constitution of the United States in respect to the admission of a new State, is, that its Constitution shall be republican in form. California presents such a Constitution, and there is no doubt of her having a greater population than that which, according to the practice of the government, has been heretofore deemed sufficient to receive a new State into the Union.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"A majority of the Committee have been led to recommend to the Senate, that the two measures [the admission of California and the organ-

ization of Territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico,] be united. The bill for establishing the two Territories, it will be observed, omits the Wilmot Proviso, on the one hand, and on the other makes no provision for the introduction of slavery into any part of the new Territories. That Proviso has been the fruitful source of distraction and agitation. If it were adopted and applied to any Territory, it would cease to have any obligatory force as soon as such Territory were admitted as a State into the Union. There was never any occasion for it, to accomplish the professed object with which it was originally offered. This has been already demonstrated by the current of events. California, of all the recent territorial acquisitions from Mexico, was that in which, if anywhere within them, the introduction of slavery was most likely to take place; and the Constitution of California, by the unanimous vote of her Convention, has expressly interdicted it. There is the highest degree of probability that Utah and New Mexico will, when they come to be admitted as States, follow the same example. The Proviso is, as to all those regions in common, a mere abstraction. Why should it be any longer insisted on? Totally destitute, as it is, of any practical import, it has, nevertheless, had the pernicious effect to excite serious if not alarming consequences. It is high time that the wounds which it has inflicted should be healed up and closed; and that to avoid in all future time the agitations which must be produced by the conflict of opinion on the slavery question—existing as this institution does, in some of the States, and prohibited in others—the true principle which ought to regulate the action of Congress, in forming Territorial governments for each newly acquired domain, is to refrain from all legislation on the subject in the Territory acquired, so long as it retains the Territorial form of government, leaving it to the people of such Territory, when they have attained to a condition which entitles them to admission as a State, to decide for themselves the question of the allowance or prohibition of domestic slavery, The Committee believe that they express the anxious desire of an immense majority of the people of the United States, when they declare that it is high time that good feelings, harmony, and fraternal sentiments should be again revived, and that the Government should be able once more to proceed in its great operations to promote the happiness and prosperity of the country, undisturbed by this distracting cause.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"The Committee would now proceed to the consideration of, and to report upon the subject of persons, owing service or labor in one State, escaping into another. The text of the Constitution is quite clear: 'No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.' Nothing can be more explicit than this language—nothing more manifest than the right to demand, and the obligation to deliver up to the claimant, any such fugi-

tive. And the Constitution addresses itself alike to the States composing the Union, and to the General Government. If, indeed, there were any difference in the duty to enforce this portion of the Constitution between the States and the Federal government, it is more clear that it is that of the former than of the latter. But it is the duty of both. It is now well known and incontestible, that citizens in slave holding States encounter the greatest difficulty in obtaining the benefit of this provision of the Constitution. The attempt to recapture a fugitive is almost always a subject of great irritation and excitement, and often leads to most unpleasant, if not perilous collisions. An owner of a slave, it is quite notorious, can not pursue his property for the purpose of its recovery, in some of the States, without imminent personal hazard. This is a deplorable state of things, which ought to be remedied. The law of 1793 has been found wholly ineffectual, and requires more stringent enactments. There is especially a deficiency in the number of public functionaries authorized to afford aid in the seizure and arrest of fugitives. Various States have declined to afford aid and co-operation in the surrender of fugitives from labor, as the Committee believe, from a misconception of their duty arising under the Constitution of the United States. It is true that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has given countenance to them in withholding their assistance. But the Committee can not but believe that the intention of the Supreme Court has been misunderstood. They can not but think that that Court merely meant that laws of the several States which created obstacles in the way of the recovery of fugitives were not authorized by the Constitution, and not that State-laws affording facilities for the recovery of fugitives were forbidden by that instrument.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"But whatever may be the conduct of individual States, the duty of the General Government is perfectly clear. That duty is to amend the existing law, and to provide an effectual remedy for the recovery of fugitives from service or labor. In devising such a remedy, Congress ought, while on the one hand securing to the owner the fair restoration of his property, effectually to guard on the other against any abuses in the application of that remedy.

"In all cases of the arrest within a State, of persons charged with offenses; in all cases of the pursuit of fugitives from justice, from one State to another; in all cases of extradition provided for by treaties between nations—the proceeding is uniformly summary. It has never been thought necessary to apply, in cases of that kind, the forms and ceremonies of a final trial. And when that trial does take place, it is in the State or country from which the party has fled, and not in that in which he has found refuge.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"The majority of the Committee are of the opinion that the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, ought to be abolished. It is a trade some-

times exhibiting revolting spectacles, and one in which the people of the District have no interest, but, on the contrary, are believed to be desirous to have it discontinued. Most, if not all of the slaveholding States have, either by their constitutions or by penal enactments, prohibited the trade in slaves as merchandise in their respective jurisdictions. Congress may safely follow this example of the States.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"If such of these measures as require legislation should be carried out by suitable acts of Congress, all controversies to which our late territorial acquisitons have given rise, and all existing questions connected with the institution of slavery, whether resulting from those acquisitions, or from its existence in the States and in the District of Columbia, will be amicably settled and adjusted, in a manner, it is confidently believed, to give general satisfaction to an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States. Congress will have fulfilled its whole duty in regard to the vast country which, having been ceded by Mexico to the United States, has fallen under their dominion. It will have extended to it protection, provided for its several parts the inestimable blessing of a free and regular government adapted to their various wants, and placed the whole under the banner and flag of the United States."

Mr. Clay's Exposition of the Report.

On the 13th of May, Mr. Clay went at large into an exposition of the report of the Committee of Thirteen. The following are extracts from his speech on that occasion:

"Mr. President, I am not discouraged by any thing that has transpired in the Committee or in the Senate, or in the country, upon the subject of this measure. I have believed from the first, and I yet firmly believe, that, if these unhappy subjects which have divided the country are to be accommodated by an amicable adjustment, it must be upon some such basis as that which the Committee [of Thirteen] have reported; and can there be a doubt on the mind of any honorable senator on the subject? Sir, I believe that the crisis of the crisis has arrived; and the fate of the measures which have been reported by the Committee will, in my humble judgment, determine the question of the harmony or continued distraction of the country. Entertaining this belief, I can not but indulge the hope that honorable senators, who, upon the first hearing of the report, might have seen some matters in it objectionable, according to their wishes and judgment, and that the entire Senate, after a full consideration of the plan, and after a fair contrast between it and all the other proposed plans, and all the other practicable plans for the adjustment of these questions—whatever expectations and hopes may have been announced elsewhere out of this body—will ultimately give it a general concurrence."

California.

"How is it with California? You have deserted her; you have abandoned her; you have violated your engagement contained in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and left her to shift for herself as well as she could. In this state of abandonment she chose to form to herself a Constitution, and she has come here to ask for admission; and I ask again, as I had occasion to ask three months ago, whether she does not present herself with much stronger claims for admission than those States which had all the advantages of a free government, and which came here to be admitted into the Union?"

Change of Public Feeling.

"The minds of men have moderated; passion has given place to reason everywhere. Everywhere, in all parts of the Union, there is a demand—a demand, I trust, the force and effect of which will be felt in both Houses of Congress—for an amicable adjustment of these questions, for the relinquishment of those extreme opinions, whether entertained on the one side or on the other, and coming together once more as friends, as brethren, living in a common country, and enjoying the benefits of freedom and happiness flowing from a common government."

Recommendation of the President.

"Sir, I think, if the President had at this time to make a recommendation to Congress, with all the lights that have been shed upon the subject since the commencement of this session of Congress, nearly five months ago, he would not limit himself to a recommendation merely for the admission of California, leaving the Territories to shift for themselves as they could or might. He tells us in one of those messages, that he had reason to believe that one of the Territories, at least New Mexico, might possibly form a State government for herself, and might come here with an application for admission during the progress of this session. But we have no evidence that such an event is about to happen; and if it did, could New Mexico be admitted as a State? At all events, there has been such a change of circumstances since the message was sent in, that I can not but believe, that the gentleman who now presides at the head of our public affairs, if he had had the benefit of all these lights, would have made the recommendation much more comprehensive, and much more general and healing in its character, than a simple recommendation for the admission of California, leaving all the other questions unsettled and open, to exasperate the feelings of parties."

Claims of Utah and New Mexico.

"Sir, I have spoken of the abandoned condition of Utah and New Mexico, left without any authority of this government, acting locally to

protect the citizens who go there to settle, or to protect those who are *in transitu* through the country, without any authority connected with the supreme government here, or any means of communicating from time to time the state of things as they exist there. To abandon these countries, in the face of our obligations contained in the treaty of Hidalgo, and other high obligations by which we are bound—to abandon them thus, would not, as appears to me, be conformable to that duty which we are called upon to perform. Leave these Territorial questions unsettled, and the door of agitation is left wide open; settle them, and it is closed, I hope forever."

Mr. Benton's Two Cannons.

"Sir, the Committee recommend the union of these three measures. [Settling the boundaries of Texas, and organizing the Territories of Utah and New Mexico.] If the senator from Missouri will allow me the benefit of those two *cannons* pointing to this side of the House [alluding to the two volumes of Hatsel], I shall be much obliged to him."

Mr. Benton had objected to "tacking" incongruous subjects in one bill, and read from Hatsel on Parliamentary usages. Mr. Clay replied by showing what American Congressional usages had been, and cited instances of joining things in the same bill, which had no affinity. But there was affinity in the subjects of this bill, and they were not, therefore, incongruous, even if incongruity of subjects were objectionable; but it was not. It was very common to unite things in the same bill, which were totally unlike, as was shown by Mr. Clay. Although the "two cannons" were not on Mr. Benton's desk, as Mr. Clay supposed, he turned them on his opponent, and fired them off from memory. He also opened an American battery, and demonstrated American usages, by an effective fire.

Slavery Abolished in Mexico.

"I shall not enlarge on the opinion which I have already announced to the Senate as being held by me on this subject, [that slavery had been abolished in Mexico, and consequently did not exist in the Territories acquired from Mexico by the United States]. My opinion of the law of Mexico, in all the variety of forms in which legislation can take place—that is to say, by the edict of a dictator, by the Constitution of the people of Mexico, and by the act of the legislative authority of Mexico—by all these modes of legislation, my opinion is that slavery has been abolished there. I am aware that some other senators entertain a different opinion; but without going into a discussion on that question, I feel authorized to say, that the opinion of a vast majority of the people of the United States,

of a vast majority of American jurists, is in coincidence with that which I entertain; that is to say, that, at this moment, by law and in fact, there is no slavery there."

Fugitive Slave Law.

"The Committee have proposed two amendments to be made in the bill introduced by the senator from Virginia [Mr. Mason], whenever the bill is taken up. The first of these amendments provides, that the owner of a fugitive slave, when leaving his own State, and whenever it is practicable, shall carry with him a record from the State from which the fugitive has fled; which record shall contain an adjudication of three facts, first the fact of slavery, and secondly the fact of an elopement; and in the third place such a general description of the slave as the court shall be enabled to give upon such testimony as is brought before it. It also provides, that this record, taken from the county court, or from the court record in the slave State, shall be carried to the free State, and shall be there held to be competent and sufficient evidence of the facts which it avows."

Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, here asked, "Is it proposed that the certificate shall be from the judge or from the court?"

Mr. Clay: "Mr. President, I confess I had in view the County courts, and the courts of Probate."

Trial by Jury Agreed to in Committee.

"The other amendment," said Mr. Clay, "provides, that when the owner of his property shall arrest his property in a non-slaveholding State, and shall take him before the proper functionary, to obtain his certificate to authorize the return of that property to the State from which it fled, if he [the alleged fugitive] declares that he is a free man, said functionary [commissioner or other officer] shall take a bond, without surety, from the agent or owner, etc., that he will give the alleged fugitive a trial for his freedom before the first court that shall be convened after his return."

We have stated, in the ninth chapter, that Mr. Clay was not present in the Senate when this bill came up and was passed. We have also intimated that the act is not altogether such as he would have desired. We have looked into the law, as published in the Statutes at Large, to see if the amendments, as specified above by Mr. Clay, and agreed to in committee, were actually carried out. We find the substance of the first amendment somewhat altered; but the second—the most important of the two—does not appear at all. Mr. Clay seems to have regarded the second amendment as a trial by jury. For he says: "The trial by jury is what is demanded by the non-slaveholding States. Well, we put the party claimed to be a

fugitive back to the State from which he fled, and give him a trial by jury in that State." This is Mr. Clay's explanation of the amendment agreed to in committee; but it is not in the law. If Mr. Clay had been present, when the bill was before the Senate, it probably would have been there. He evidently expected it, as having been agreed to in the committee.

Difficulties of the Subject.

Mr. Clay said:

"On all subjects of this kind, we must deal fairly and honestly by all. We must recollect that there are prejudices, and feelings, and interests, and sympathies, on both sides of the question; and no man who has ever brought his mind seriously to the consideration of a suitable measure for the recapture of runaway slaves, can fail to admit that the question is surrounded with great difficulties. * * * In the slave holding States the rule is, that color implies slavery, and the *onus probandi* of freedom is thrown on the person claiming it. On the contrary, in the free States, the *onus* is shifted, and the fact of slavery must be proved. Every man of color in the free States is regarded as free; and when he is claimed as a slave, the feelings of the people are naturally excited in his favor. We all respect these feelings."

Higher Law and Natural Law.

"There is one opinion prevailing which nothing that we can do will conciliate. I allude to that opinion which asserts that there is a higher law —a divine law—a natural law—which entitles a man, under whose roof a runaway slave has come, to give him assistance, and succor, and hospitality. Where is the difference between receiving and harboring a known fugitive slave, and going to the plantation of his master and stealing him away? And who are they that venture to tell us what is Divine and what is natural law? Where are their credentials? Why, sir, we are told, that the other day, at a meeting of some of those people at New York, Moses and all the prophets were rejected, and Christ blasphemed! If Moses and the prophets, and our Saviour are to be rejected, will they condescend to show us their authority for this new Divine law? The law of nature, sir? Look at it, as it is promulgated, and attempted to be enforced, in some parts of the world. There is a large class who say, that if a man has acquired a large estate by his own exertions, or by inheritance, they are entitled by a law of nature to have a portion of it. An other modern law of nature is, that the possession of more land than you can cultivate, is a forbidden monopoly. Heaven supersedes the parch ment from Government! Wild, reckless, and abominable theories, which strike at the foundation of all property and threaten to crush in ruins the fabric of civilization!" * * *

"The Committee, in considering this delicate subject, and looking at the feelings and interests of both sides of the question, thought it best to offer these two provisions—that which requires the production of a record in the non-slave holding States, and that which requires a bond to grant to the real claimant of his freedom a trial by jury in the place where that trial ought to take place, according to a just interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, in order to obviate the difficulties which have been presented, and to satisfy the prejudices of the non-slave holding States, we propose to give the fugitive the right of trial by jury in the State from which he fled."

How Trials for Freedom in a Slave State are Managed.

"The statement in the report is perfectly true, that the greatest facilities are always extended to every man of color in the slave holding States who sues for freedom. I have never known of an instance of a failure on the part of a person thus suing to procure a verdict and judgment in his favor, if there were even slight grounds to support his claim. And, so far is the sympathy in behalf of a person suing for his freedom carried, that few members of the bar appear against them. I will mention—though with no boastful spirit—that I myself never appeared but once in my life against a person suing for his freedom; but have appeared for them in many instances, without charging them a solitary cent. That, I believe, is the general course of the liberal and eminent portion of the bar throughout the country. One case [above alluded to] I made an exception; but it was a case where I appeared for a particular friend. I told him: 'Sir, I will not appear against your negroes, unless I am perfectly satisfied that they have no right to freedom; and even if I shall become, after the progress of the trial, convinced that they are entitled to freedom, I shall abandon your cause.'"

It appears, however, that in the absence of Mr. Clay, when this bill was up and passed, only the first of these two amendments agreed on in Committee, to which Mr. Clay attached so much importance, was put in the bill; and that, too, in a qualified and attenuated form, to serve the convenience of, and save expense to, the claimant of the alleged fugitive. The other, by far the most important of the two, to wit, a trial by jury, if the fugitive claims to be a freeman, does not appear in the act. It is evident, therefore, as we have stated in the ninth chapter, that the fugitive slave law did not fully satisfy the wishes, and carry out the plan of Mr. Clay, although he was placed in circumstances in which he was obliged to vindicate it. Although there would be a natural jealousy in the free States, in the rendition of an alleged fugitive, to be tried for his freedom in a

slave State, Mr. Clay gives the reason of universal custom in the rendition of fugitives from justice, the principle of which he thinks, applies to an alleged fugitive slave; and he also thinks, as above stated by himself, that a man of color, held as a slave, but claiming to be a free man, has a fair chance in a court of a slave State. It should, however, be remembered, that the feeling of the people of the free States would naturally be against trusting the decision of the question of a man's right to himself, to those who advocate slavery and hold slaves. What Mr. Clay says of the fair chances of a colored man, before a court in a slave State, suing for his freedom, may be true; and all who knew Mr. Clay, know that he believed what he said, with ample observation and much experience. But since the fugitive slave law awards no such trial for freedom as Mr. Clay intended it should, it is rather out of place to enlarge on the point.

Suppression of the Slave-trade in the District of Columbia.

On the bill for the suppression of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, among other things, Mr. Clay said:

"I believe the first man in my life that I ever heard denounce that trade, was a Southern man—John Randolph of Roanoke. I believe there has been no time within the last forty years, when, if earnestly pressed upon Congress, there would not have been found a majority—perhaps a majority from the slave-holding States themselves—in favor of the abolition of the slave-trade in this District. The bill which the Committee has reported, is founded upon the law of Maryland, as it existed when this District was set apart and ceded to the United States. * * * Sir, some years ago it would have been thought a great concession to the feelings and wishes of the North, to abolish this slave-trade. Now, I have seen some of the rabid abolition presses denouncing it as amounting to nothing. It is nothing that slavery is interdicted in California. They do not care for all that. * * * At the beginning of this session, as you know, that offensive proposal, called the Wilmot Proviso, was what was most apprehended, and what all the slave-holding States were most desirous of getting rid of. Well, sir, by the operation of causes upon the Northern mind friendly to the Union, hopes were inspired which I trust will not be frustrated in the progress of this measure, that the North, or at least a sufficient portion of the North, are now willing to dispense with the Proviso." * * *

New Difficulties.

"Mr. President, after we have got rid, as I had hoped, of all these troubles—after this Wilmot Proviso has disappeared, as I trust it may,

both in this and in the other end of the Capitol—what are the new difficulties that spring up around us? Matters of form. The purest question of form that was ever presented to the mind of man—whether we shall combine, in one united bill three measures, all of which are necessary and homogeneous; or separate them into three distinct bills, passing each in its turn, if it can be done."

An Appeal to Patriotism.

"Mr. President, I trust that the feelings of attachment to the Union, of love for its past glory, of anticipation of its future benefits and happiness; a fraternal feeling which ought to be common throughout all parts of the country; the desire to live together in peace and harmony; to prosper as we have prospered heretofore; to hold up to the civilized world the example of our great and glorious Republic fulfilling the high destiny that belongs to it, demonstrating beyond all doubt, man's capacity for self-government—these motives and these considerations will, I confidently hope, and fervently pray, animate us all, bringing us together, to dismiss alike all questions of abstraction and mere form, and consummating the act of concord, harmony, and peace, in such a manner as to heal not one only, but all the wounds of the country."

Mr. Foote Friendly to the Bill.

Mr. Foote, of Mississippi, who at first showed great opposition to Mr. Clay's resolutions, became the earnest advocate of the report of the Committee of Thirteen. At the close of his speech, May 16th, he said:

"Mr. President, I confess that I am ambitious to co-operate with patriotic men of all parties, at this fearful and perplexing crisis. I wish to assist in re-establishing those ties of fraternal affection which once so strongly bound together the whole body of our countrymen, which has been so alarmingly enfeebled of late, and which, it is to be feared, are at this moment in danger of utter extinction. This is the whole complexion and extent of my ambition, and I devoutly beseech the Almighty, that He would vouchsafe its gratification. Let me be loaded with denunciation, derision, contempt, and even infamy; and yet shall I be able to endure it all without a murmur, provided it shall at the same time be admitted by my adversaries, that my happy country and its free institutions have been rescued in part by my poor exertions, from the overthrow with which they are now threatened by sectional jealousies, by fierce and fiery fanaticism, by untempered zeal, and it may be, in part also, by a selfish and unscrupulous ambition for local ascendency and influence. * * * I do not in the least degree doubt, that my conduct here will stand approved by those to whom I am chiefly responsible. But even if it be my fate to incur condemnation where I have hoped for approval, I shall never regret for an instant, what

I am now doing; and I feel authorized to close this hasty and irregular speech, with the prediction that the indications now everywhere so apparent in favor of the plan of settlement before us, will continue to multiply upon our vision, until the acclamations of twenty millions of people shall be heard to break forth upon the consummation of that scheme of *peace*, of *conciliation*, and of *compromise*, which is to mark the year 1850 as the most happy and most glorious in our national annals."

Hard to Please Both Sides.

May 21st, Mr. Clay said:

"I am accused at the North of casting unmerited opprobrium upon the right of trial by jury and the administration of justice; while at the South, in another and in the last extreme, from which I should not have expected any thing of the kind, I find that the amendment [agreed to in Committee for trial by jury on the return of the fugitive, if he claims to be a free man] is objected to as creating embarrassments to the owners of fugitive slaves. Sir, this is something like the old song:

> "'I do not like thee, Dr. Fell,
> The reason why I can not tell;
> But this I know, and know full well,
> I do not like thee, Dr. Fell.'"

This amendment, however, as has been seen, did not become a part of the law, Mr. Clay not being there to advocate it, when the bill was on its passage.

No Slavery in New Mexico

"I can not," said Mr. Clay, May 21st, "agree to an amendment [to the territorial bill for New Mexico] which, *in point of fact*, assumes that slavery has an existence there at this time, and which assumes, *in point of law*, that under the Constitution of the United States, there is a right to carry slaves there. I can not vote for either proposition."

How to Quiet the Union.

"I am not one of those who, either at the commencement of this session, or at any time during its progress, have believed that there was any present actual danger to the existence of the Union. But I am one of those who believe, that if this agitation is continued for one or two years longer, no man can foresee the dreadful consequences. A dissolution of the Union, the greatest of all calamities, in my opinion, which can befall this country, may not in form take place; but next to that is a dissolution of those fraternal kindred ties which bind us together as one free, Christian, and commercial people. In my opinion, the body politic can not be preserved, unless this agitation, this distraction, this exasperation, which is going on between the two sections of the country, shall cease. Unless it

do cease, I am afraid that this Union, for all the high and noble purposes for which our fathers formed it, will not be preserved. * * *

"Let us suppose that Congress does nothing; let us suppose that it fails to furnish a remedy for any one of the evils which now afflict the country. Suppose we separate and go home under those mutual feelings of dissatisfaction and discontent which will arise out of the failure of Congress to adjust these questions. I will say nothing of the reproach and opprobrium that will be brought upon us by all Christendom. I will say nothing of those who are looking on us with anxious solicitude, under the hope that we will fulfill all the expectations and the high destinies which appertain to one among the greatest of all countries. I will say nothing of that large portion of mankind who are gazing with intense anxiety upon this great experiment in behalf of man's capacity for self government and man's freedom. I will say nothing of all this. Suppose, then, that after the lapse of six or seven months, during which we were vainly endeavoring to reconcile the distracted and divided parts of the country, we go home full of the feelings of rage and animosity, one section against another. In such a state of feeling can the Republic long continue? * * *

"It has been said, that nothing has been done for the South in the establishment of these Territorial governments; nothing in this measure of compromise. What, sir? Is there nothing done for the South, when there is total absence of all Congressional action on the delicate subject of slavery—when Congress remains passive, neither adopting the Wilmot Proviso on the one hand, nor authorizing the introduction of slavery on the other—when every thing is left in *statu quo?* What was the South complaining of all along? The Wilmot Proviso—a proviso which, if it be fastened upon this measure—as I trust it may not be—will be the result, I apprehend, of the difficulty of pleasing Southern gentlemen. Their great effort, their great aim, has been, for several years, to escape from that odious measure. The proviso is not in the bill. The bill is silent. It is non active on the subject of slavery. The bill admits that if slavery is there, there it remains. The bill admits, that if slavery is not there, there it is not. The bill is neither Southern nor Northern. It is equal; it is fair; it is a compromise, which any man, whether at the North or at the South, who is desirous of healing the wounds of his country may accept, without dishonor or disgrace, and go home with joy in his heart. Neither the North nor the South have triumphed. There is perfect reciprocity. The Union only has triumphed."

Mr. Clay's Reply to the Charge of Delaying the Public Business.

On the 12th of June, Mr. Clay said:

"Sir, while I am up, feeble as I am, I feel constrained by the connection which I have with this subject, and with the committee, to make a few

observations in reply to the gentleman who sits in this now vacant seat [Mr. Seward]. Sir, the senator from New York began with an assertion which I utterly deny, to wit, that the effort to get these measures passed had arrested the progress of public business, and prevented Congress from discharging its duties. Now let us look a little into this matter. There has been no compromise measure before the other branch of Congress. How, then, I ask him, has the proposition for Compromise in this branch of Congress interrupted the public business in the other? But so far from its being true that the committee and the majority of the Senate are liable to the charge of interrupting the progress of the public business, the senator himself, and those who co-operate with him, are the true and legitimate cause of the interruption of the public business in this branch of Congress. And how, sir? How? I will tell you how, and the country shall know how it is. I find by a memorandum which has been placed in my hands, that on the 13th day of February, the senator from Mississippi [Mr. Foote] made his motion for the appointment of a Committee of Thirteen. If the committee had been appointed according to the ordinary course of legislative proceeding, if it had been appointed as it ought to have been, for such an object as national reconciliation, without opposition; if, as an experiment to settle the distractions of the country, every senator had voted for it as in my humble opinion, without wishing to cast reproach upon any one, they ought to have done, three months ago we might have had a report, and a definitive settlement of the question. The minority, who perseveringly, from first to last, resisted the appointment of the committee, and after the committee was appointed, resisted action upon the report of the committee—they—I charge them before the country, and the senator from New York, who now sits on my right hand, among the rest—they, sir, are the true causes of the interruption of the public business—not of Congress, but of this branch of Congress. How often did the Senate, by a majority decisive and conclusive, express itself in favor of this committee? How often were instructions and other modes of delay resorted to?

"I should be justified in applying a term which I forbear to apply to the course of this minority, which, from the beginning to the end, has been the cause of the impediment to the public business in this branch of Congress. The gentlemen who were not satisfied with the expression of the opinion of the majority once, twice, three, and four times, but who resorted to every possible means of thwarting the declared and known wish of the majority—I charge *them* with being the cause of the obstruction, if there has been any, in the dispatch of the public business. Sir, what have we been doing this week—this precious week—when the whole country is looking on with undivided anxiety for some definite conclusion of this question, and when the other House also may be naturally anxious to hear what is the opinion of the accordant branch of the legislature? On the first day of this very precious week, a motion was made on which to hang speeches, and three days afterward, when the speeches were deliv-

ered, a withdrawal takes place of the proposition! And yet we, the majority, are to be charged with impeding the progress of business! Sir, a more unjust, a more unmerited, a more unfounded charge was never preferred against the majority of any body on earth. The delay does not come from us. Why, sir, an attempt was made to lose a whole week after the return from the funeral ceremonies of one of our colleagues—and it was made apparently, too, by some concert. To postpone, to delay, to impede, to procrastinate, has been the policy of the minority in this body; and yet they rise up here and charge us, who have been anxious for speed—for the speedy appointment of the committee, for a speedy report, and speedy action on that report—they charge us with causing delay! As little delay took place in the committee, as was proper, on a subject of such vast complication and magnitude; and since the report of that committee, it has been our anxious wish, our most ardent desire, to come to a final conclusion upon the important questions which are involved in the report. What has been done by that committee, and by myself, as an humble member of it? We have taxed our physical powers, and required the meeting of the daily sessions to be fixed an hour earlier, and we sat out all the working days last week, and yet we are to be charged with delaying the public business! Sir, I answer for my friends of the majority, I answer for the committee, that they will be ready and willing, if they are permitted by the minority to do it, to come to a final decision in less than six days from this time. Sir, I felt the injustice of the unfounded imputation of delay to this committee, with such a degree of sensibility, that I forgot the weak and feeble, and I might almost add, the trembling limbs with which I have come to this body to-day."

A Skirmish with Mr. Benton.

Although Mr. Clay was scarcely able to stand, he yet had to speak again several times this day, at considerable length, and give all his attention to the debate. Weak as he was, he could not resist an occasion of pleasantry. Mr. Benton, in his opposition, had read a speech of Mr. Clay, from three different sources. Whereupon Mr. Clay rose and said:

"Mr. President, I wish to state, that I thought once or twice of calling the senator from Missouri to order. I believe it is out of order to read a bill three times the same day, without a unanimous consent. I think the rule ought to extend to a speech. The senator read my speech three times, which would have been out of order if the same rule applied to speeches which applies to bills. I think one reading might have answered the purpose of the honorable senator."

It was at this time that Mr. Clay specified the requisite qualifications of a lecturer and those who are lectured, which we have

cited in the text. Mr. Benton had lectured the Senate and Mr. Clay, and Mr. Clay said he thought two things were requisite for the success of such an attempt: ability in the lecturer to handle his subject, and a favorable reception with his audience. The lecture applied to Mr. Clay's throwing back the charge of delaying public business, from the majority on the minority, above cited.

"Now," said Mr. Clay, "how did this dispute as to who caused the delay, arise? Did I begin it? Did not the senator from New York [Mr. Seward], one of the conspirators with the senator from Missouri, begin it? Was I doing any thing more than repelling an unfounded charge made against the majority of the Committee of Thirteen? This discussion did not originate with me."

Mr. Benton's Accusation against Mr. Clay for Inconsistency, Answered.

Mr. Clay was charged by Mr. Benton with inconsistency, which was answered by Mr. Clay, as follows:

"Mr. President, at the commencement of this session of Congress, when I heard that California had formed a State Constitution, which was to be submitted to Congress in the course of a few weeks, I own that I was for her immediate admission. I regretted that it could not be done. If it depended on me, it should have been done before this. But I have aimed throughout life to be a practical man, and to give and take, to yield to all cases not involving essential principles. And, sir, do you not know, does not every member of the Senate know, that after two or three weeks had elapsed, after I had ascertained the condition of the two Houses of Congress, I adopted the opinion, upon which I have acted ever since, that the speediest mode of admitting California, was by a combination of these several measures. Every senator knows that these were my views, and every senator knows that I expressed them in this body; and if the senator from Missouri, instead of confining himself to the reading of a single speech from the *Republic* of yesterday, had looked at other speeches of mine—and he does me honor in reading any of my speeches—he would have seen that I have assigned the causes why I was induced to abandon the ground of a separate admission of California, for a combination. He would also have seen, that I did it in reference to practical legislation, and to the condition of the other House, and of this House. There is no great difference of principle involved in the two modes. It is true we have heard a great deal about the dignity of California, and all that, sir. The most perfect microscopic instrument that was ever made, would not enable the best eyes that man was ever blessed with, to see this indignity to California, in being associated with other measures."

A Spasm.

Mr. Clay read a letter to show that Mr. Benton had also changed his mind as to the admission of California. Whether it was the truth of the letter that produced the effect, we know not; but Mr. Benton was quite excited and said:

"I consider him [Mr. Clay] the author of that letter. He has adopted it. He has produced it in the American Senate. He has read it here, and as his letter I brand it as a most infamous calumny; and with that brand upon it, it shall go upon the parliamentary history of the country."

A senator: "Call him to order."

The Vice President: "The senator is not in order."

Mr. Benton: "Every body is in order but me. Every body is in order to attack me; but I am not in order to defend myself. He must take care how he produces such things against me."

The Vice President: "The senator is not in order."

Mr. Clay: "I shall only say, that I repel with scorn and indignation the imputation, that I am the author of that letter. I hurl it back to him, that he may put it in his casket of calumnies, where he has many other things of the same sort."

The Vice President: "The senator is not in order."

Mr. Benton: "You hurl it back; but I got it on you first."

The Vice President: "Order must be restored in the Hall."

Mr. Webster: "I have only risen to say, that I am exceedingly pained that such occurrences should take place in the Senate."

Mr. Benton: "Oh! it is damnable!"

We do not remember the instance in which Mr. Clay was ever before called to order by the Chair, in the Senate of the United States. It must be allowed, that he had a strong provocation to say what he did say on this occasion. He had been accused by Mr. Benton of changing his opinion on the question, whether California should be admitted by herself alone, or be put in a bill with other measures, the latter of which was done by the Committee of Thirteen. The truth of the accusation was acknowledged by Mr. Clay, and he gave his reasons for it, which, no doubt, were very satisfactory to all persons, except Mr. Benton, who was disposed to make much of it. Mr. Clay, who at first was in favor of putting California through alone, came over to the opinion of a majority of the committee, that it would put these measures in peril, if they should be sent down to the House of Representatives in separate bills, and as a practical

man, he agreed to put them in one bill. As every body appreciated his reasons, he cared nothing for the accusation of Mr. Benton, except as it took up so much time of the Senate, in being obliged to listen to Mr. Benton's speeches on the subject. Whether it was to stop those speeches, we know not; but Mr. Clay thought proper to read the letter referred to, which did stop them very effectually, and turned matters into a new channel—a short, but very disturbed and boiling current. It foamed and raged for a moment, and then plunged into the sea.

The President's Plan.

July 6, Mr. Bell said:

"It is said, that the three most distinguished gentlemen who support the plan of the Committee [of Thirteen], the senator from Kentucky [Mr. Clay], from Massachusetts [Mr. Webster], and from Michigan [Mr. Cass], have assumed a position from which they can not be moved, and that they will never accede to the plan of adjustment proposed by the President."

Mr. Clay: "Will the senator allow me a word of explanation?"

Mr. Bell: "With pleasure."

Mr. Clay: "I have never said that this plan, and this plan only, could command my approbation. So far from it, I have said, Show me any plan that will pacify the country, and give peace and harmony, and I will dismiss all my feelings of pride, all feelings connected with any aid I have given in conducting this plan. Nor did I ever say, in reference to California, that I would not vote for her admission, if this plan were not adopted, but quite the contrary. I have said, from the first to the last, I was in favor of a combination of measures, as containing equivalents and concessions, and more likely to pass the two Houses of Congress. But that being admitted, I was prepared to vote for the admission of California also. I know my friend does not intend to misrepresent me, but I have no attachment to any plan. If I saw in the plan of the President, one which would settle these great questions, I would embrace it with pleasure, and I would trample my own under my feet. Yes, sir, I would embrace any plan, come from what source it may, which will accomplish the great object of peace and concord."

Mr. Bell: "These are noble sentiments, and such as we had a right to expect from the character of the senator." * * *

Mr. Clay: "I have thought, and have come to the conclusion, that this plan [that of the Committee] only is likely to succeed. With respect to the admission of California separately, I know nothing more than the senator himself [Mr. Bell]. He knows what has been threatened, and what is likely to occur in the other House." [Parliamentary tactics, calling of the House, yeas and nays, etc.]

Another Affair with Mr. Benton.

On July 16th, Mr. Benton had said of the bill of the Committee of Thirteen:

"The bill is caught—*flagrante delicto*—taken in the fact, seized by the throat, and held up to public view [here Mr. B. grappled the bill and held it up], and in the very act of perpetrating the crime, in the very act of auctioneering for votes to pass itself."

To which Mr. Clay replied:

"Now, sir, with regard to the boa-constrictor struggle between the senator and the bill, the issue of it may be what it pleases; but, sir, I put it to the Senate and to the country, whether language such as this is admissible upon the floor of the Senate—'auctioneering for votes to carry the bill.' Who auctioneered? The bill, or the Committee? If the senator means to say that the Committee, or any member of the Committee, auctioneered, or that it was the intention of the bill to auctioneer for votes to carry it, I repel the charge as a groundless and unfounded implication. But, sir, is not such language as this remarkable to be used in a deliberative body? Why, sir, it would be applicable to every case of appropriation of money. It might be said that the object is to bribe, to auctioneer for votes, to purchase votes, in order to carry the appropriations. When I heard that remark, I could not help being struck with the bill—which I ask the Secretary to read—which the senator himself introduced in the early part of the session."

It was a bill offering *fifteen millions of dollars* to Texas, in consideration of her relinquishing certain territorial claims—a bold and a high bid.

After Mr. Benton's bill was read by the Secretary of the Senate, so far as to show the bid, Mr. Clay said:

"That will do, sir. A proposition to Texas, to give her $15,000,000 for the cession proposed by that bill to be made by her to the United States. Well, sir, I wish to know, what is the difference in principle between the bill of the senator, and the bill reported by the Committee? * * * When the Committee concur in favor of a sum, not equal to that which the senator proposed, by 50 or 100 per cent., it is auctioneering for votes to carry the bill, while no such purpose was designed by the senator in offering *his* bill! * * * Who is the senator that is to be purchased or auctioneered for? Who the member of the House? Where is he? * * * I feel myself called upon to repel, as I do, any charge of the kind. That Committee, sir, is known to the country, and I am proud of the association I have had with its members, many of whom have served their country in the highest places of honor, abroad and at home." * * *

Mr. Benton replied, and reiterated the charges, concluding with the words, "Now, let him call me to order."

Mr. Clay: "Well, as the senator from Missouri wishes to be called to order, I call him to order, and I will write down the words and have them handed to the Chair."

When brought to the point by the Chair, as to whether Mr. Benton intended to be personal, or reflect on the Committee, he got out of the difficulty, by saying, that "his words were confined to the *bill and its effects*, and that he had a right to speak of the *effect* of a measure in whatever terms he pleased," of which there could be no doubt.

The Dubious Prospects of the Bill.

We cite the following senatorial colloquy, to show that senators, friends of the bills reported by the Committee of Thirteen, were beginning to think what would be done if this first bill under debate should fail.

On the 17th of July, Mr. Webster said:

"I have supposed, if we should admit California by herself, the very next thing to be done, would be to take up the subject of the Territories. * * * Here sits the honorable member from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], who is at the head of the Committee on Territories. I take it for granted he can say, whether I am right or not, that if we should this day admit California alone, he should to-morrow feel it his duty to bring in bills for the government of the Territories?"

Mr. Douglas: "Does the senator wish me to say?"

Mr. Webster: "Certainly, I should like to know."

Mr. Douglas: "Mr. President, if California should be admitted by herself, I should certainly feel it to be my duty, as chairman of the Committee on Territories, to move to take up the Territorial bills at once, and to put them through; and also the Texas boundary question, and to settle them in detail if they are not settled in the aggregate; and I can say, that such is the opinion and determination of a majority of the Committee."

It was evidently understood in the Senate, at this time, that if the bill then pending should fail, the same measures would be immediately brought forward each in a separate bill.

Mr. Webster's Opinion of the Nashville Convention.

Mr. Webster said:

"The Nashville address was a studied disunion argument, though he would not impute to the South generally the sentiments of the Nashville Convention."

Congress has no Responsibility for Slavery in a State.

On the 9th of July, Mr. Clay said:

"Mr. President, the senator from Georgia [Mr. Berrien] has advanced a position which I oppose entirely; and what is it? That if Congress admits California, it admits California with her restrictions as to slavery, and that admitting California, with her constitution restricted as to slavery, is equivalent to the passage of the Wilmot Proviso. I deny it, I utterly deny it, sir. I am not now speaking of consequences, of effects, but of power, of authority. What has been the doctrine of the South throughout this whole controversy, for three or four years past, with regard to imposition by Congress of restrictions upon the Territories as to slavery? The doctrine of the South, and of the senator among them, has been, that Congress has no power over the subject—that Congress has no Constitutional power to impose the interdiction, and that if Congress does impose it, it is a usurpation of power. That is their doctrine—I do not mean to say that it is my own. My opinions have been expressed. It is not necessary to repeat them. But that is the doctrine of the South, and that is the doctrine which I am combating. Now, sir, with regard to admitting a State having itself inserted an article in her Constitution prohibiting slavery. Does Congress pass upon that article? Does it pass upon any provision? Can it constitutionally pass upon any provision contained in the Constitution of a State submitting herself to be admitted into the Union? The sole inquiry is, is it a republican Constitution or not? That is the single restricted inquiry which Congress can make. If there are provisions of a local or municipal character, provided they do not impair the republican form of government, Congress is not responsible for them one way or the other. It is their own affair.

"And, sir, when speaking of the doctrine of the South, let me remind you, that one among the wisest and most eminent of Southern men [Mr. Calhoun], not three years ago, by a resolution submitted to this Senate, declared the doctrine to be, that a State, when forming for herself a Constitution, and proposing to come into the Union, had exclusive power to decide for herself, whether she would or would not have the institution of slavery.

"Now, Mr. President, I am not going into that sophistry into which I might be led by the argument, that when Congress admits a State, and that State has interdicted slavery, that therefore Congress has interdicted slavery. Congress has no such power. The power of Congress in the case, is limited to ascertaining that the character of the State Constitution is republican. Now, sir, the difference between the case put by the senator from Georgia, and the case before the Senate—between the exercise of the power by Congress and its exercise by the State—is a case of the difference between the usurpation of power and the legal and constitutional exercise of power by a State which has chosen to judge for itself. He has

confounded usurpation and lawful authority, legality and illegality, what may be done by Congress and what may be done by a State. If you can set up every thing, mix all the matters together, and say that right and wrong, authority and the absence of authority, are the same, why, then, the opinion might triumph that, although we are limited to a solitary inquiry on the admission of a State, the admission of slavery acquires a legality by our act which it would not otherwise have possessed."

Mr. Clay's Last Great Speech on the First Bill of the Committee of Thirteen.

The following extracts are made from Mr. Clay's speech on the 22d of July, in answer to the objections which had been made to the bill in the course of this long debate, which was now about drawing to a close, and which terminated in the defeat of the bill the 31st of this month—July. It should be remembered, that the two bills for the fugitive slave law, and for the suppression of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, which were reported by the Committee of Thirteen, had not yet come under debate; but that it was the bill for the admission of California in combination with those for settling the bounds of Texas, and organizing the Territories of Utah and New Mexico, which occupied the attention of the Senate for such a long period.

On the 22d of July, Mr. Clay said:

"I rise, Mr. President, to perform a duty which appertains to my position. In the progress of this debate, it has been again and again argued, that perfect tranquillity reigns throughout the country, and that there is no disturbance threatening its peace, endangering its safety, but that which was produced by busy, restless politicians. It has been maintained that the surface of the public mind is perfectly smooth and undisturbed by a single billow. I most heartily wish I could concur in this picture of general tranquillity that has been drawn upon both sides of the Senate. I am no alarmist; nor, I thank God, at the advanced age to which His Providence has been pleased to allow me to reach, am I very easily alarmed by any human event. But I totally misread the signs of the times, if there be that state of profound peace and quiet, that absence of all just cause of apprehension of future danger to this Confederacy, which appear to be entertained by some other senators. Mr. President, all the tendencies of the times, I lament to say, are toward disquietude, if not more fatal consequences. When, before, in the midst of profound peace with all the nations of the earth, have we seen a convention, representing a considerable portion of one great part of the Republic, meet to deliberate on measures of future safety in connection with the great interests of that part of the country?

When, before, have we seen, not one, but more—some half a dozen—legislative bodies solemnly resolving, that if any one of these measures—the admission of California, the adoption of the Wilmot Proviso, or the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia—should be adopted by Congress, measures of an extreme character, for the safety of the great interests to which I refer, in a particular section of the country, would be resorted to! For years, this subject of the abolition of slavery, even within this District, small as is the number of slaves here, has been a source of constant irritation and disquiet. So of the subject of the recovery of fugitive slaves—not a mere border contest, as has been supposed—although there, undoubtedly it has given rise to more irritation than in other portions of the Union—but everywhere through the slave-holding country, it has been felt as a great evil, a great wrong, which requires the intervention of Congressional powers. But these two subjects, unpleasant as has been the agitation to which they have given rise, are nothing compared to those which have sprung out of the acquisitions recently made from the Republic of Mexico. These are not only great and leading causes of just apprehension as respects the future, but all the minor events of the day intimate danger ahead."

The Two Committees of Thirteen, in 1821, and in 1850, Compared.

"Mr. President," said Mr. Clay, "I will not dwell upon other concomitant causes all having the same tendency, and all well calculated to awaken, to arouse us—if, as I hope, the fact is, we are all of us sincerely desirous of preserving this Union—to rouse us to dangers which really exist, without underrating them upon the one hand, or magnifying them, on the other.

"It was in this stage, or state, rather, of the Republic, that my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Foote], something more than four months ago, made a motion for the appointment of a Committee of Thirteen. Unlike what occurred at an analogous period of the Republic, when it was my duty to make a similar motion in the other end of the Capitol, and when, on account of the benefits which might result from the reconciliation of a distracted country, the proposition was immediately adopted—on the present occasion, *unlike* what occurred at that period, the proposition of the honorable senator from Mississippi, was resisted from day to day, from week to week, for four or five weeks. An experiment to restore the harmony of the country met with the most determined and settled resistance, as if the measure which the Committee might report, whatever might be its character, would not still be under the power and control of the Senate, to be disposed of according to its own best judgment. Finally, however, the motion prevailed."

Compliment to General Cass and other Democrats.

"Sir, I have been in repeated consultation with my friend [General Cass], for so I will call him, during the progress of this measure, and also

with other Democratic friends; and he [General Cass] has shown himself to be the friend of the peace of his country. Repeatedly have I been in consultation with them upon the subject of this bill and the amendments which have been proposed. I regret only that our consultations could not have been more numerous and of longer duration. On the subject of slavery, the treatment of California, the Territories, the fugitive slave bill, and the suppression of the slave-trade in this District, there is no difference of opinion between myself and my Democratic friends, whom I have had occasion to consult, but perfect union. Not a solitary instance of party politics, upon which we might have heretofore differed, has been adverted to, in any of our consultations. We spoke of that measure which absorbed all our thoughts, which engrossed all our hopes, which animated all our anxieties—the subject of pacifying, if possible, the distracted parts of this country—a subject upon which, between us, there was a perfect coincidence of opinion. * * * In our meetings upon the subject, in our consultations, Democrats and Whigs convened and consulted together. They threw aside, as not germane, and unworthy of their consideration, all the agitating party politics of the day; and I venture to say, that in those meetings between my Democratic friends and myself, there was no diversity or contrariety of opinion upon the only subject that brought us together. If I am not utterly mistaken, there is no such union and coincidence of opinion between the opponents of this bill, who, upon the very subject of slavery to which it relates, are as wide apart as the North and South poles. Whose eyes have not witnessed the consultations between the extremes of this chamber, from day to day? The eyes of every discerning senator must have noticed it. But whether in the consultations between those ultra gentlemen of the South, there was any mixture of the abolition element, I could not say. * * *

"Mr. President, there is neither incongruity in the freight nor in the passengers, on board of our 'Omnibus.' We are all heartily concurrent upon the only topic which brought us together, and which constitutes the sole subject of our consultation. We have no Africans or Abolitionists in *our* 'Omnibus,' no disunionists or Free Soilers, no Jew or Gentile. Our passengers consist of Democrats and Whigs, who, seeing the crisis of their common country, and the dangers impending over it, have met together, forgetting and throwing far behind them their political differences on other subjects, to compare their opinions on this great measure of reconciliation and harmony."

Application of the Compromise Principles—When, Where, and How.

"The honorable senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Davis] says, there are no parties who can make a compromise. Will the senator excuse me for saying, that this remark smells too much of the technicalities of Blackstone? No parties! Are there not great conflicting interests, conflicting

opinions, pervading the whole country? Who are the parties of that greatest of all compromises—the Constitution of the United States? There were no technical parties to that instrument; but in deliberating on what was best for the country, and perceiving that there were great and conflicting interests pervading all its parts, they compromised and settled them by ample concessions, and in the spirit of true patriotic amity. They adjusted those conflicting opinions; and the Constitution under which we sit at this moment is the work of their hands—a great, a memorable, a magnificent compromise, which indicates to us the course of duty when differences arise which can only be settled by the spirit of mutual concessions."

The Dawn of Day.

"I have heard, Mr. President, that a different temper prevails at this time—that it is possible to carry these measures, if they are presented in succession, just as they have been reported by the committee. I take the occasion to say—and I am sure I express the sentiment of every member of the committee—that we are not prompted by the pride of opinion, or wedded to any given system of arrangement, or settlement of these great national questions. We preferred combining them in one measure, because we thought it most practical, and most likely to lead to an auspicuous result. But, if it can not be adopted in the conjoint form reported by the committee, and if the desired object can be better attained by action upon a series of successive measures, without the odious proviso [the Wilmot], not a murmur of complaint, I am quite sure, will ever be heard from a single member of the committee. It is not the means, it is the great specific end, we have in view; and however that end is attained—whether by such an arrangement as this committee has proposed, or by separate acts of legislation—the committee and myself are utterly indifferent. But it is known to you that if all the measures comprised in the bill under consideration, are not passed, there is danger that in the presentation of these measures in detail, some of them would fail, and the result would be, that while one party got all that it immediately wanted, the other would obtain nothing which it desired. You know there was great cause to apprehend —I hope there may be none now—that in the separate presentation of the measures, the consequence would be the attachment of the Wilmot Proviso, in one or the other of the two Houses, and the utter failure to establish any territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico. It was thought, then, that in the spirit of our Revolutionary sires, in the spirit which has heretofore pervaded the history of our government, conciliating and reconciling as much as possible opposing and conflicting interests and opinions, we would present a measure which would bind all, and that would lead both parties, as far as practicable, to unite upon it for the sake of harmony and tranquility." * * *

A Paradox.

"This subject has presented one of the most extraordinary political phenomena that I ever witnessed. Here is an almost united Senate, in favor of

all the measures in detail; in favor of the admission of California; in favor of territorial governments for Utah and New Mexico, with or without that proviso; in favor of the settlement of the boundary with Texas—in favor of all these measures in detail; but opposed to them when they come to be presented to be acted upon unitedly: admitting the validity of every item of the account, but when it comes to be footed up, denying or unwilling to acknowledge the justice of paying the aggregate!"

Intolerance of Opinion.

"Mr. President, it is one of the peculiar circumstances attending my present position, as I remarked on a former occasion, that I am generally called upon to vindicate the measures proposed in this bill, against those whom we have regarded as the friends, as well as those who are considered as the open, avowed opponents of the measure. I anticipated the other day somewhat the argument which I beg leave barely to advert to now. I think among our Southern friends, two or three great errors are occasionally committed. They interpret the Constitution according to their views; they engraft their exposition upon it; and without listening to, or giving due weight to the opposite interpretations, to the conflicting exposition which is as honestly believed by their opponents as by themselves, they proclaim their own exposition of the Constitution, and cry out, 'All we want is the Constitution!' In the comparison and expression of opposite opinions, infallibility is not the lot of mortal man. It belongs only to Him who rules the destinies of the world; and for any section of the Union, or any set of gentlemen, to rise up and say, 'The Constitution means so and so, and he who says otherwise, violates the Constitution,' is, in itself, intolerant, and wanting that mutual forbearance and deference which are due to conflicting opinions honestly entertained by all who are sincerely aiming to arrive at the truth. Now, I said the other day, that the Wilmot Proviso, as proposed to be enacted by Congress, and incorporated in territorial bills, was a question totally distinct from the insertion of a restriction of slavery in the Constitution formed by a newly organized State." * * *

Change of Opinion on the Wilmot Proviso.

"Now, do not our Southern friends who oppose this bill upon the ground that there is an interdiction to the introduction of slavery in the California Constitution, and that that is an interdiction exercised unlawfully by Congress, according to their views—do they not confound truth and falsehood, black and white, things totally dissimilar? * * * Three years ago, two years ago, one year ago—one short year ago—the great complaint on the part of the slave-holding states of this Union, was the apprehended infliction upon their interests of a restriction called the Wilmot Proviso. Well, we have met together, there has been a change of public opinion, a modification of public opinion, at the North. And allow me to say, that with regard to that most important portion of our Union—its north-west section—

that no man is more entitled to honor and gratitude for this salutary change, than the honorable member in my eye [Mr. Cass], who represents Michigan. He came here with his hands tied and bound by a restriction which gave him no other alternative than a violation of his conscientious sense of duty, or a resignation of his seat into the hands of those who sent him here. But discussions have taken place in this House, in the country, in the press —they ran through the North, and Michigan nobly released and untied the hands of her senators, and left them free to pursue their own best judgment to promote the interests of their country—and this is the feeling of all the north-west."

A Prediction.

"Let me remind those gentlemen who are desirous for the greatest extension of the theater of slavery, of a danger—of a great and imminent danger which they are incurring. I venture a prediction, not likely, perhaps, to be fulfilled or decided in the short remnant of my life—that, if Texas retains all the territory now claimed by her—nay, I go further, although the contingency I am about to state is less likely to happen by the curtailment of the boundary—I venture to say, that in some thirty, forty, or fifty years, there will be no slave State in the limits of Texas at all. I venture to predict that the Northern population—the population upon the upper part of the Rio Grande—will, in process of time, greatly outnumber the population holding slaves upon the Gulf and upon the lower waters of Texas; and that the majority will be found adverse to slavery, so that it will either be abolished, or its limits effectually circumscribed. This is no new opinion with me. I think I gave the same opinion in a letter which I wrote some six years ago from Raleigh, North Carolina."

The Federal Constitution can not carry Slavery into the Territories, nor protect it there.

"In my opinion, the supposition that the Constitution of the United States carries slavery into California, supposing her not to be a State, is an assumption totally unwarranted by the Constitution. Why, sir, if the Constitution gives this privilege, it would be incompetent for California to adopt the provision which she has in her Constitution. The Constitution of the United States being supreme, no State could pass an enactment in contravention of the Constitution. My rules of interpreting the Constitution of the United States, are the good old rules of '98 and '99. I have never in my life deviated from those rules, and what are they? The Constitution is an aggregate of ceded powers. No power is granted, except when it is expressly delegated, or when it is necessary and proper to carry into effect a delegated power. And if, in any instance, the power to carry slaves into the Territories is guarantied to you by the Constitution, I have been unable to perceive it. Amid all the vicissitudes of public life, and amid all the changes and turns of party, I have never in my life deviated

from those great and fundamental, and I think indisputably true, principles of interpreting the Constitution of the United States. Take those principles to be true, and where is the power—can any body point it out to me—which gives you a right to carry your slaves to California [as a Territory]? Where is the delegated power, or the power to which it attaches as a necessary implication? It is nowhere to be found. You must resort to some such general principles as the Federalists did in the early history of this country, when they contended for the doctrine of 'the general welfare.' But you can not put your finger on that part of the Constitution which conveys the right or the power to carry slaves from one of the States of the Union to any Territory of the United States."

A Dilemma.

"I must confess, that those senators who have contended for an express recognition of the right to carry slaves South of that line [36° 30′], have contended for something much more perfect and efficient than to run a naked line without any such declaration. But, then, there are two considerations, which impose insuperable objections to any such recognition or declaration to carry slaves South of that line. The first is that you can not do it without an assumption of power on the part of Congress to act upon the institution of slavery; and if they have the power in one way, they have the power to act upon it in the other way; and the power to act upon it either way, is what you have denied, and opposed, and endeavored to prevent being accomplished for the last two or three years. It would be an assumption, an usurpation, according to the Southern doctrine, for Congress to exercise any power, either to interdict or establish slavery upon either side of a given line. The other objection to attempt to accomplish this end, is, that it is impracticable and unattainable. A majority neither of this House, nor of the other House—not one third, probably, of this House, and perhaps a still smaller portion of the other House—could be got to affirm any right of transporting slaves [into the Territories] south of 36° 30′. It is, then, wrong in principle, and impracticable, and inexpedient. Why, then, let me ask, contend for a line, which, if attainable at all, is attainable without value, without necessity, without advantage to the South? Or why attempt that which is utterly unattainable—a line which should secure any express provision for the power or right, on the part of the slaveholder, to carry his slaves south of it?"

The Principle of Non-intervention by Congress in the Matter of Slavery.

On the 23d of July, Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, offered the following amendment to the Territorial bill for New Mexico before the Senate:

"And that all laws and usages existing in said Territory, at the date of its acquisition by the United States, which deny or obstruct the right of any citizen of the United States to remove to and reside in said Territory, with any species of property legally held in any of the States of this Union, be and are hereby declared to be repealed."

Speaking on the proposed amendment, Mr. Clay said:

"Mr. President, the great principle which pervades thoughout this bill, is the principle of non-intervention by Congress upon the subject of the institution of slavery. Now, sir, what is the amendment proposed? It is better to come at once plainly to the point. If I understand precisely the object of the amendment, it is this: There are laws existing in California [not at this time admitted into the Union], and in the other Territories acquired from Mexico, which, according to one opinion, are supposed to abolish slavery. Now, Congress has no power to intervene upon the subject of slavery, according to the Southern doctrine. How, then, can Congress repeal laws which have abolished slavery, and which create an obstruction to the transportation of slaves to those Territories? If Congress can repeal existing laws prohibiting slavery, could not Congress enact laws authorizing the introduction of slavery, or, if slavery was existing there, of abolishing slavery? If that is so, the great principle of non-intervention seems to me to be as clearly violated in attempts to repeal local laws [on this subject], as it could be violated in attempts, by the power of Congressional enactments, to introduce or prohibit slavery."

We have cited the above remarks of Mr. Clay, in anticipation, that they might be employed in justification of the 32d section of the act organizing the Territory of Kansas. Clearly the Congress of 1854, in assigning "the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise measures," as the reason or ground of its action in repealing the Missouri Compromise of 1820, was not entitled to go *back* of that "legislation," *behind* those "measures," to the debates which preceded them, for the authority which itself declares to issue from those acts of "legislation." The act of 1854 asserts a *fact* as authority for repealing the Missouri Compromise line, to wit, "the principle of non-intervention by Congress on the subject of slavery, as *recognized* by the legislation of 1850." The principle is not a fact, but the *recognition* of that principle is the fact alleged; and the recognition is nowhere to be found in the statute. Private opinion, uttered in debate, might be right, or it might be wrong; but it would not be appealed to as authority for a public act. It was not appealed to, although this was doubtless what the author of the

32d section had in his mind when he drew it up. He was a conspicuous actor in "the Compromise measures of 1850," and knew all about it. What Mr. Clay says in the first sentence of the above citation from him, is doubtless true, and no man knew it better than the author of the 32d section of the act of 1854. Nevertheless, this knowledge could not authorize him to declare a *recognition* of that principle as contained in the acts of 1850, and to base upon it the repeal of the Compromise line of 1820, when the fact of such recognition is nowhere to be found in those measures.

None will deny that Mr. Clay and his coadjutors, in framing "the Compromise measures of 1850," most scrupulously abstained from all intervention on the institution of slavery, or that this extreme caution is evinced by them as by Mr. Clay in the passage above cited. No doubt "the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery" is involved in those measures; but this very abstinence proves that it could not be "*recognized*," as alleged in the 32d section of the act of 1854.

But Mr. Clay's concluding words in the above citation, settle the question:

"According to the Southern doctrine, Congress has no power to intervene upon the subject of slavery [in the Territories or elsewhere]. How, then, can Congress *repeal* laws [as the act of 1854 has done] which have abolished [or prohibited] slavery, and which create an obstruction to the transportation of slaves to those Territories? If Congress can repeal *existing* laws prohibiting slavery, could not Congress enact laws authorizing the introduction of slavery, or, if slavery *was* existing there, of abolishing slavery?"

Nothing, surely, is more evident than that the law of 1854 is an act of intervention by Congress on the subject of slavery, and a very effective one. The repeal of a law is a positive act; and in this case it happened to be a law prohibiting slavery North of a certain line.

If, therefore, the 32d section of the act of 1854 is to stand as law, be defended as such, trampling under foot the doctrine of non-intervention, on which it is professedly founded, then, according to the reasoning of Mr. Clay, above cited, it has opened the door for legislation on slavery by Congress, to any extent, and for any purpose whatever, in the States as well as in the Territories.

The Day After the Defeat of the Bill.

In the latter part of the eighth chapter, we have stated that the defeat of the bill, which had been under the charge of Mr. Clay as Chairman of the Committee of Thirteen, which had so long occupied the attention of the Senate, was a victory—a perfect triumph of Mr. Clay. So it was. Nevertheless, the victory was not evident to all minds at that moment. The first announcement to the country of the defeat of the bill, was astounding; for the country had been waiting in anxious expectation for the passage of the measure, and it was confidently expected. The effect of this disappointment was so great, that nothing could efface the impression from the public mind. To this day it is extensively, if not generally supposed, that Mr. Clay was defeated. The measure certainly was defeated for the time. Rightly to understand the crisis—for such it was—demands a consideration of what preceded and of what followed. Mr. Clay had some misgivings, but he believed the bill would pass, down to the last day. This was the general feeling in the Senate and out of it. We have seen the colloquy between Mr. Webster and Mr. Douglas, a few days before the final trial on the bill, when the former asked the latter what he would do, as Chairman of the Committee of Territories, if the bill should fail, and we have had the answer. We have also had occasion to observe occasional doubts in the mind of Mr. Clay. But as the bill was expected to pass, few in the Senate or out were prepared for the result as it happened.

We observe, however, that Mr. Douglas, Chairman of the Committee on Territories, brought in a bill for the admission of California, on the first of August, the day after the defeat of the bill in question—a very prompt action, and precisely in accordance with the question made to him by Mr. Webster: "If this bill should fail to-day, would you bring in that bill to-morrow?" Mr. Douglas answered, "Yes," and he did so.

But we think, in truth, the defeat of the bill produced a general consternation in both Houses of Congress, and in the country. Mr. Clay's long protracted argument, running through several months, his pleadings, his warnings, had made a deep, a profound impression on the Senate, on Congress, on the whole Union. The great majority in Congress and out, were unwilling, afraid to risk the consequences of the failure of these compromise

measures. The first bill, so long debated, had failed; Mr. Clay's leadership had come to an end by this event; with anxious mind he had done his duty, and could do no more. The whole responsibility, with all its tremendous weight, now fell back on the bosom of the Senate. They must up and be doing, or all was lost. They must pass the very measures which Mr. Clay had proposed, and so long pleaded for, if they could. Those measures had received their shape from Mr. Clay's hand, and the Senate never thought of giving them any other shape. It was too late, if they desired it. But they did not desire it. They did not dare to do it. They knew too well, that the country demanded those very measures, and that the people would hold the Senate of the United States responsible, if they should fail. We are not surprised, therefore, to find the bill for the admission of California before the Senate the very next day after the defeat of the first bill reported by the Committee of Thirteen. On this day, Mr. Clay, with solemn dignity, rose in his place and said some very grave things in reference to the past and the future.

Who Defeated the Bill.

"I wish to say only a few words. We presented to the country a measure of peace, a measure of tranquillity—one which would have harmonized, in my opinion, all the discordant feelings which prevail. That measure has met with a fate not altogether unexpected, I admit, on my part, but one which, as it respects the country at large, I deplore extremely. For myself, personally, I have no cause of complaint. The majority of the committee to which I belonged, have done their duty, their whole duty, faithfully and perseveringly. The measure was defeated by the extremists on the other side of the Chamber, and on this. I shall not proceed to inquire into the measure of responsibility which I incurred. All I mean to say upon that subject is, that we stand free and liberated from any responsibility of consequences. How it was defeated, we know full well. The proposition of the senator from Maryland [Mr Pearce], made, no doubt, upon a conscientious conviction of his duty, led to the defeat—was the immediate cause of it. That proposition led to consequences which are fresh in the recollection of the Senate." * * *

The Contingencies of the Future.

"Now, Mr. President, I stand here in my place, meaning to be unawed by any threats, whether they come from individuals, or from States. I should deplore, as much as any man, living or dead, that armies should be raised against the authority of the Union, either by individuals or States.

But, after all that has occurred, if any one State, or a portion of the people of any State, choose to place themselves in military array against the Government of the Union, I am for trying the strength of the Government. [Applause in the galleries.] I am for ascertaining whether we have got a Government or not—practical, efficient, capable of maintaining its authority, and upholding the powers and interests which belong to a government. Now, sir, am I to be alarmed or dissuaded from any such course by intimations of the spilling of blood? If blood is to be spilt, by whose fault will it be? Upon the supposition, I maintain it will be the fault of those who raise the standard of disunion, and endeavor to prostrate this Government; and, sir, when that is done, so long as it pleases God to give me a voice to express my sentiments, and an arm, weak and enfeebled as it may be by age, that voice and that arm will be on the side of my country, for the support of the general authority, and for the maintenance of the powers of this Union." [Applause in the galleries].

The Chair: "Order!"

Mr. Walker: "If any thing ever gave me pleasure, it is to hear such sentiments as the senator from Kentucky has spoken, applauded, though I do not say it for the purpose of encouraging it."

Mr. Clay still Hopes.

Mr. Clay: "Mr. President, I have done all—I am willing to do all that is in the power of man to do, to accommodate the differences of the country. I have not been attached to any given form of settling our troubles and of restoring contentment to the Union. I was willling to take the measures united. I am willing now to see them pass separate and distinct, and I hope they may be passed so, without that odious Proviso which has created such a sensation in every quarter of the Union. But whether passed or not, I repeat the sentiment, if resistance is attempted to any authority of the country, by any State, or by any people of any State, I will raise my voice, my heart, and arm, in the support of the common authority of the General Government. Nor am I apprehensive that blood is to be shed. From the bottom of my heart I hope it never will be. But if it should, who will be responsible? Those who attempt to prostrate the general authority upon the supposition I have made—that a single State—if there shall be one—or the people of any State, choose to raise the standard of disunion, and attempt to destroy this Union by force. God knows I should deplore it. But if it must occur, I will be among the last who will give up the effort to maintain the Union in its entire, full, and vigorous authority.

"Sir, these threats are not so alarming or so dangerous, as some in their imagination may suppose. We have had an event of the kind in our history. When Washington was our President—now sixty years ago—the standard of insurrection was raised in the western part of Pennsylvania. The army of the United States moved forward for the purpose of subduing it. There was some little blood shed in the house of Colonel Neville

But the insurgents then—as disunionists and traitors always will—fled from the approach of the flag of the Union, supported by the authority of the Union, and countenanced by the Father of the Union."

A Weighty Responsibility.

They who recollect the doings of the Nashville Convention, so lately held, and which represented the South generally, will appreciate the portentous position of the country at this moment, on the contingency that these Compromise measures of Mr. Clay could not be passed.

It will have been seen, in the above remarks of Mr. Clay, that he held the senator from Maryland [Mr. Pearce], to a very serious account for the loss of the bill the day before. It was the more serious and the more to be regretted, because Mr. Clay and Mr. Pearce had always acted in the same party, and because Mr. Clay had relied on Mr. Pearce as a friend of the bill.

Mr. Pearce rose and said: "The senator from Kentucky has said, that the amendment which I offered to the Senate yesterday, was the direct cause of the defeat of the bill."

Mr. Clay (in his seat): "The immediate cause."

Mr. Pearce: "The immediate cause. I admit that the defeat of the bill was subsequent to my amendment. But I am not willing that the defeat of the bill should be laid at my door, unless I am justly chargeable with it. From any just responsibility I will not shrink. * * * To this bill, as introduced by the Committee, I had given a cordial assent. * * * The bill defeated yesterday was not the bill which it was on Tuesday last. * * * The form the bill assumed after the amendment of the senator from Georgia [Mr. Dawson] was not what we had been discussing for months. * * * I told the senator from Georgia, when he presented the amendment, that it would defeat the bill. I told the senator from Mississippi [Mr. Foote] that I should be forced to vote against it."

Mr. Foote: "At the interview to which the senator alludes I supposed it was the amendment, not the bill, in opposition to which he would vote."

Mr. Pearce: "It [my course] produced the defeat of the bill, it is said; but if the senator from Texas had thought proper to accept the proposition I offered, this would not have been the result."

Mr. Pearce sent the following note to the reporter of his remarks on this occasion, that it might appear with them:

"The amendment of the senator from Georgia was carried, not by the friends of the bill, but by a portion of the friends of the bill uniting with a large number of senators known to be opposed to the bill. The votes

of twelve senators known to be opposed to the bill, were given to this amendment, besides the vote of the senator from Alabama [Mr. King], the senator from Georgia [Mr. Berrien], and the senator from Texas, whose support of the measure was contingent, though they were anxious to adjust the dispute; so that not half of those who voted for the amendment of the senator from Georgia, were decided friends of the bill."

Mr. Pearce said:

"I will not shrink from the responsibility, and I will never cease to defend and vindicate my course."

Mr. Clay: "Nor will I, sir. It belongs to the history of the country, and it will go out. With regard to the senator's motion, and his ready and fearless encounter of the responsibility, I say nothing. I suppose upon that subject he is like most other men. But I repeat what I said, that the immediate cause of the loss of the bill, was the amendment of the honorable senator [Mr. Pearce]. I make no reproaches against him. * * * Still the truth remains, and the senator has told us that he has no objection to assume the whole responsibility. * * * When the amendment was offered by the senator from Georgia, the senator [Mr. Pearce] did not oppose it by any speech. He did not say what he said yesterday. He made no intimation so serious to that amendment, that, if adopted, the consequence might be the loss of his vote. But that is not all. Now, sir, I want to call the attention of the senator to his own course yesterday, upon this subject. Three times was the senator approached with amendments containing, I believe, substantially the very object which he was desirous to accomplish. One was taken from my chair to him. The second was given to him by his neighbor, the senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], who had obtained the previous consent of the senators from Texas. There were one or two others. The senator declined to accept of any amendment, but persisted in his own, and that persistence led to the consequences to which I have alluded. Not only did he fail to take the suggestions of the friends of the bill, but when the senator from Florida [Mr. Yulee], one of the most determined opponents of the bill, asked him to divide his motion, which was inseparable by the rules of the Senate, the moment the appeal was made, he yielded to his wishes. If he had persevered in his own motion to *strike out and insert*, I doubt if the result would have been the same. These are facts, none of which, I presume, the senator is disposed to call in question. I make no reproaches to the senator. I have no doubt he has acted upon conscientious motives, nor do I doubt of his willingness to meet all the responsibility. But, having been charged with this bill, being chairman of the committee who reported it, I thought it right the country should know the circumstances under which it was lost."

Mr. Pearce replied with considerable ability, and concluded with the following remark:

"If you go back to the remote cause of the defeat of the bill, it rests on the amendment of the senator from Georgia, to which the senator from Kentucky yielded."

How far the senator from Maryland was influenced in his course on this occasion, by the humor manifested in the following sentences, it may not, perhaps, be easy to divine:

"Sir, I know very well I am too humble a member of this body, to be consulted by any one as to what he should do; but, if I had been consulted in regard to this amendment [Mr. Dawson's], I should have stated frankly, that I was opposed to it, and could not sustain it. But being too obscure to be consulted, and not having been consulted, this amendment was sprung on me, and I thought it my duty to oppose it in the best way I could."

Most assuredly, this would have been a fearful way of showing one's power, and not less fearful in its responsibility, if the Senate had not afterward enacted each of the measures contained in this bill, and if the contingencies so much feared by Mr. Clay, had come on the country.

There is no doubt that Mr. Dawson's amendment vitiated the bill very essentially—more, perhaps, than Mr. Clay himself was aware of at the moment it was under consideration; for it might have left New Mexico under military rule, which, as we have seen, Mr. Clay was altogether opposed to. But it had passed, and could not, as we suppose, be reconsidered. Should the bill be sacrificed for that? Mr. Clay and its other friends did not think so. But the senator from Maryland thought proper to brave the responsibility of defeating the measure.

Mr. Clay Rebukes the Southern Senators for their Opposition to the Bill.

"There is a language too often employed by senators now and heretofore speaking for the South—'The South, the whole South.' Sir, I should think it would be very fortunate, if senators were always confident that they were able to represent the sentiments of their own particular State, without attempting to speak of States whose respective domains are exterior to their own. Now, I speak in no unkind spirit toward the senator from Virginia; but I believe that, if the people of Virginia had been here, four fifths of them would have voted for that Compromise measure which the senator from Virginia has felt it his duty to oppose. I know that the opportunities of the senator from Virginia are much better than my own to obtain information of their wishes; but I profess to know something of the State that gave me birth, and I believe that if the people

of Virginia were to be polled to-morrow, three fourths or four fifths of them would be found to be in favor of that measure. Now, sir, do the honorable senators from Virginia and South Carolina imagine that, when they return to their constituents with the opposite opinions prevailing upon the subject of this Compromise, of this olive-branch held out to the whole Union—do they expect to be able to have the sword drawn against the Union, amid such a conflict of opinions as will arise in the slave holding States, upon the very ground of the rejection of this Compromise?"

Nullification—Civil War.

"Mr. President, I have said that I want to know whether we are bound together by a rope of sand, or an effective, capable Government, competent to enforce the powers therein vested by the Constitution of the United States? And what is the doctrine of Nullification, set up again, revived, resuscitated, neither enlarged nor improved, nor extended in this new edition of it? That when a single State shall undertake to say, that a law passed by the twenty-nine States is unconstitutional and void, she may raise the standard of resistance, and defy the twenty-nine. Sir, I denied the doctrine twenty years ago—I deny it now—I will die in denying it. There is no such principle. If a State chooses to assume the attitude of defiance to the sovereign authority, and set up a separate nation against the nation of twenty-nine States, it takes the consequences upon itself, and the question is reduced to this: Shall the twenty-nine yield to one, or the one yield to the twenty-nine? Call it by what mystic name you please—a State, a corporation, a sovereignty—whatever force of a State is put in array against the authority of the Union, it must submit to the consequences of revolt, as every other community must submit when a revolt is made.

"Gentlemen lay to their souls the flattering unction that the army is composed of officers from Virginia, South Carolina, and other Southern States, and the army will not draw their swords. What, sir, the army of the United States under the command of the Chief Magistrate of the United States—under the command of the gallant officer recently making the conquest of Mexico—not do their duty? Gentlemen will find themselves utterly mistaken, if such a state of things arises."

What is Patriotism?

"But we are told this story of Bernadotte, and I may say I did not put the case of Virginia. I respect her. I venerate her. She is my parent, and I have always feelings toward her which are inspired in the filial bosom toward its parent. I did not put the case of Virginia by name. The honorable senator from South Carolina put his words in my mouth, when he made me refer to his State. But if any State chooses to array itself in authority, and give orders to its citizens to set themselves in military or hostile array against the Union, the Union is gone, or the resistance must

cease. The honorable senator tells us of the story of Bernadotte, who, when he came to the confines of France, was unwilling to invade his native country. Let me remind the senator of a case much more analogous to true republican liberty doctrine than the case of the King of Sweden, who was made such under the authority of Bonaparte, whom he resisted. I admire more that Roman father who, for the sake of Rome, condemned and caused to be executed his own son. That is my notion of liberty.

"And with respect to my country, the honorable senator speaks of Virginia being my country. This Union, sir, is my country; the thirty States are my country; Kentucky is my country; and Virginia no more than any other of the States of this Union. She has created on my part obligations, and feelings, and duties toward her in my private character, which nothing upon earth would induce me to forfeit or violate. But even if it were my own State—if my own State, lawlessly, contrary to her duty, should raise the standard of disunion against the residue of the Union, I would go against her. I would go against Kentucky herself in that contingency, much as I love her."

Mr. Benton on the Fugitive Slave Law.

The following extract is from the pen of the Hon. Thomas H. Benton. We do not insert it as adopting all its reasoning, but to verify what we have elsewhere stated,* that Mr. Clay had nothing to do in the construction or passage of this law, to corroborate some other statements we have made regarding it, and to give some further light as to its history and character:

"The Pennsylvania act [of 1847] did not remain a dead letter upon her statute book; a citizen of Maryland, acting under the federal law of '93, in re-capturing his slave, was prosecuted under the kidnapping clause of the State act of '47—convicted—and sentenced to its penalties. The constitutionality of this enactment was in vain pleaded in the Pennsylvania court: but her authorities acted in the spirit of deference and respect to the authorities of the Union, and concurred in an "*agreed case*," to be carried before the Supreme Court of the United States, to test the constitutionality of the Pennsylvania law. That court decided fully and promptly all the points in the case, and to the full vindication of all the rights of a slaveholder, under the reception clause in the constitution. The points decided cover the whole ground, and, besides, showed precisely in what particular the act of 1793 required to be amended, to make it work out its complete effect under the constitution, independent of all extrinsic aid. The points were these:

"'The provision of the act of the 12th of February, 1793, relative to fugitive slaves, is clearly Constitutional in all its leading provisions; and,

* Pages 288, 365, & 367.

indeed, with the exception of that part which confers authority on State magistrates, is free from reasonable doubt or difficulty. As to the authority so conferred on State magistrates, while a difference of opinion exists, and may exist on this point, in different States, whether State magistrates are bound to act under it, none is entertained by the court, that State magistrates may, if they choose, exercise that authority, unless forbid by State legislation.' 'The power of legislation in relation to fugitives from labor, is exclusive in the national legislature.' 'The right to seize and retake fugitive slaves, and the duty to deliver them up, in whatever State of the Union they may be found, is, under the Constitution, recognized as an absolute, positive right and duty, pervading the whole Union with an equal and supreme force; uncontrolled and uncontrollable by State sovereignty or State legislation. The right and duty are co-extensive and uniform in remedy and operation throughout the whole Union. The owner has the same exemption from State regulations and control, through however many States he may pass with the fugitive slave in his possession, *in transitu*, to his domicil.' 'The act of the legislature of Pennsylvania, on which the indictment against Edward Rigg, for carrying away a fugitive slave, is found, is unconstitutional and void. It purports to punish, as a public offense against the State, the very act of seizing and removing a slave by his master, which the Constitution of the United States was designed to justify and uphold.' 'The Constitutionality of the act of Congress (1793) relating to fugitives from labor, has been affirmed by the adjudications of the State tribunals, and by those of the courts of the United States.'

"This decision of the Supreme Court—so clear and full—was further valuable in making visible to the legislative authority what was wanting to give efficacy to the act of 1793; it was nothing but to substitute federal commissioners for the State officers forbidden to act under it; and that substitution might have been accomplished in an amendatory bill of some three or four lines—leaving all the rest of the act as it was. Unfortunately, Congress did not limit itself to an emendation of the act of 1793; it made a new law—long and complex—and striking the public mind as a novelty. It was early in the session of 1849–50 that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported a bill on the subject; it was a bill long and complex, and distasteful to all sides of the chamber, and lay upon the table six months untouched. It was taken up in the last weeks of a nine months' session, and substituted by another bill, still longer and more complex. This bill also was very distasteful to the Senate (the majority)—and had the singular fate of being supported in its details, and passed into law, with less than a quorum of the body in its favor, and without ever receiving the full senatorial vote of the slave States. The material votes upon it before it was passed, were on propositions to give the fugitive a jury trial, if he desired it, upon the question of his condition—free or slave; and upon the question of giving him the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus*. The first of these propositions originated with Mr. Webster, but was offered in his absence by Mr. Dayton, of New Jersey. He [Mr. Webster] drew up a brief bill, early in the session, to supply the defect found in the working of the act of '93; it was short and simple; but it contained a proviso in favor of a jury trial when the fugitive denied his servitude. That would

have been about always; and this jury trial, besides being incompatible with the Constitution, and contradictory to all cases of proceeding against fugitives, would have been pretty sure to have been fatal to the pursuer's claim; and certainly both expensive and troublesome to him. It was contrary to the act of 1793, and contrary to the whole established course of reclaiming fugitives, which is always to carry them back to the place from which they fled, to be tried. Thus, if a man commits an offense in one county, and flies to another, he is carried back; so, if he flies from one State to another; and so in all the extradition treaties between foreign nations. All are carried back to the place from which they fled, the only condition being to establish the flight and the probable cause; and that in the case of fugitives from labor, as well as from justice, both of which cases are put together in the Constitution of the United States, and in the Fugitive Act of 1793. The proposition was rejected by a vote of eleven to twenty-seven. The yeas were: Messrs. Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Greene, Hamlin, Phelps, Smith, Upham, Walker, of Wisconsin, and Winthrop. The nays were: Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Cass, Davis, of Mississippi, Dawson, Dodge, of Iowa, Downs, Houston, Jones, of Iowa, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pratt, of Maryland, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Yulee. The motion in favor of granting the benefit of the writ of *habeas corpus* to the fugitive was made by Mr. Winthrop, and rejected by the same vote of eleven yeas and twenty-seven nays. Other amendments were offered and disposed of, and the question coming on the passing of the bill, Mr. Cass, in speaking his own sentiments in favor of merely amending the act of 1793, also spoke the sentiments of many others, saying:

"'When this subject was before the Compromise Committee, there was a geneaal wish, and in that I fully concurred, that the main features of the act of 1793 upon this subject, so far as they were applicable, should be preserved, and that such changes as experience has shown to be necessary to a fair and just enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution for the surrender of fugitive slaves, should be introduced by way of amendment. That law was approved by Washington, and has now been in force for sixty years, and lays down, among others, four general principles, to which I am prepared to adhere: 1. The right of the master to arrest his fugitive slave wherever he may find him. 2. His duty to carry him before a magistrate in the State where he is arrested, that the claim may be adjudged by him. 3. The duty of the magistrate to examine the claim, and to decide it, like other examining magistrates, without a jury, and then to commit him to the custody of the master. 4. The right of the master then to remove the slave to his residence. At the time this law was passed, every justice of the peace throughout the Union was required to execute the duties under it. Since then, as we all know, the Supreme Court has decided that justices of the peace can not be called upon to execute this law, and the consequence is, that they have almost everywhere refused to do so. The master seeking his slave, found his remedy a good one at the time, but now very ineffectual; and this defect is one that imperiously requires a remedy. And this remedy I am willing to provide, fairly and honestly

and to make such other provisions as may be proper and necessary. But I desire for myself that the original act should remain upon the statute-book, and that the changes shown to be necessary should be made by way of amendment.'

"The vote on the passing of the bill was twenty-seven to twelve, the yeas being: Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Berrien, Butler, Davis, of Mississippi, Dawson, Dodge, of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, of Iowa, King, Mangum, Mason, Pearce, Rusk, Sebastian, Soulé, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales and Yulee. The nays were: Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Cooper, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Greene, of Rhode Island, Smith, Upham, Walker and Winthrop. Above twenty senators did not vote at all upon the bill, of whom Mr. Benton was one. Nearly the whole of these twenty would have voted for an amendment to the act of 1793, supplying federal officers in place of the State officers who were to assist in its execution. Some three or four lines would have done that; but instead of this brief enactment to give effect to an ancient and well-known law, there was a long bill of ten sections, giving the aspect of a new law; and with such multiplied and complex provisions as to render the act inexecutable, except at a cost and trouble which would render the recovery of little or no value; and to be attended with an array and machinery which would excite disturbance, and scenes of force and violence, and render the law odious. It passed the House, and became a law, and has verified all the objections taken to it. It has been worth but little to the slave States in recovering their property, and has been annoying to the free States from the manner of its execution, and is considered a new act, though founded upon that of '93, which is lost and hid under it. The wonder is how such an act came to pass, even by so lean a vote as it received—for it was voted for by less than half the Senate, and by six less than the number of senators from the Slave States alone. It is a wonder how it passed at all, and the wonder increases on knowing that, of the small number that voted for it, many were against it, and merely went along with those who had constituted themselves the particular guardians of the rights of the slave States, and claimed a lead in all that concerned them."

Mr. Benton's reasoning on the transfer of *venue*, from the place where the fugitive slave is arrested, for a trial in the slave State where he is claimed, is far from being conclusive with the people of free States, inasmuch as the latter can not feel, that fugitives from justice stand on the same ground with fugitives from bondage. The common law of the civilized world is against fugitives from justice, and is interested in their extradition; whereas, the same law pronounces every man free as the owner of himself. It is true that in the United States, there is an exception to this rule; but still it is an exception; and the

common law prevails, until the exception be proved. Outside of the jurisdiction of slave States, common law is not on the side of the claimant of a fugitive slave, as of a fugitive from justice; but it is against such a claimant; and he can only enforce his claim, by the special legislation in his favor, and where such legislation is applicable. It is applicable wherever the master can find his runaway slave within the jurisdiction of the United States, and it can be enforced by the appointed agencies of Federal law. But if the alleged fugitive be found in a free State, he is presumed to be a free man; and freedom, as opposed to property in man, is held to be of such great price in the free States, it would be unreasonable to expect that the people of those States would ever look upon a fugitive from bondage in the same light in which they look upon a fugitive from justice, or that they should ever think that the summary mode of extradition which is applicable to criminals, is a fair way of treating a man, against whom the only crime alleged is, that he claims to own himself. Mr. Benton may think the cases analogous; but as slavery is exceptional in relation to the general condition of civilized society, so are the laws which sustain and protect it. A fugitive from bondage is not an offender against the laws of general society like the fugitive from justice, but only against the municipal regulations of the State from which he escapes. He is liable only to the arrest of Federal law enacted for his recovery. The consent is universal for the arrest of a fugitive from justice, but not so of a fugitive from bondage. Therefore the cases are not analogous.

A Letter from Mr. Clay to his Fellow-citizens in New York.

The following correspondence between Mr. Clay and numerous citizens of New York, though it took place more than a year after the legislative consummation of the Compromise measures of 1850, has such an intimate affinity and is so consistent with the topics presented in the preceding extracts from Mr. Clay's speeches on those measures, that we think it droper to give it a place in this connection.

"Hon. Henry Clay, Ashland, Kentucky:*

"Respected and Dear Sir:—There are periods in the history of nations, when the bold and manly counsel, the sagacious foresight, and

* The date of this address is not given; but the date of the answer indicates that it was sent to Mr. Clay in the autumn of 1851.

the timely and persevering efforts of the firm and patriotic statesman can succeed in averting a fearful crisis; at the same time the warning voice of the wise and the good may require to be repeated and uplifted, until it shall resound throughout the land.

"Your introduction of the Compromise measures into the Senate of the United States, and their passage by Congress, marked an epoch in our history; they arrested the nearer approach of national calamity, and, as was fondly hoped, laid the foundation for returning harmony.

"It has since, however, become but too apparent, that continued and unremitted efforts in favor of Union sentiments are necessary to resist the current of error, and secure the maintenance of sound principles of attachment to the Constitution, in order that our country may reap the blessed fruits that were expected from the Compromise of peace.

"Several of your noble coadjutors in the cause of the Union have already addressed the people, and are now addressing them, in words of truth and patriotism, of eloquence and power; and we have thought it right to appeal to the senator from Kentucky, and entreat, that one whose voice has been so often raised in defense of the people's rights, may not be silent now.

"We have a well-founded conviction that the great body of the American people are in favor of maintaining and enforcing the Compromises of the Constitution; nevertheless, in the resolutions and addresses adopted at conventions lately assembled around us, we have seen with regret, as well as alarm, that the question of adherence to the Compromise measures is avoided or evaded, that modification and amendment are declared to be requisite, and repeal, itself, admissible; as if the requirement of the Constitution, in carrying out an integral part of our national compact, was of no higher obligation than any ordinary act of legislation.

"It is evident, therefore, that there requires to be more generally diffused a spirit that will not tamper with politicians whose course must inevitably lead to the destruction of the Constitution—a spirit that will not hold communion with those who advance and support doctrines, in relation to the great national adjustment, fatal to the future peace and harmony of the Union; who merely acquiesce because they have no alternative, while, on all important occasions, they too plainly disclose, under a flimsy vail of apparent contentment, a determination to resist and oppose the efforts of the friends of the Compromise and the Union.

"We feel confident that you will not favor the abettors of such doctrines, but rather reprove and denounce them. We therefore respectfully but earnestly ask of you to leave, for a time, your retreat in Kentucky, to appear among us at New York.

"The people are profoundly grateful for your past efforts, and are proud and willing to acknowledge your timely and efficient services. They know and honor your Union principles and your national sentiments; and none are more deeply penetrated by these feelings, nor more desirous to acknowledge these obligations, than your fellow-citizens gen-

erally of this commercial emporium; and did we not think that the present crisis required your warning voice, your presence and your name, to arouse your countrymen to a sense of their duty and their danger, we would not attempt to disturb the repose of the sage of Ashland.

"GEORGE GRISWOLD,
"STEPHEN WHITNEY,
"DANIEL ULLMANN,
"And three hundred and eight others."

A committee of these three hundred and eleven citizens of New York, addressed an official note to Mr. Clay, to which the following is an answer:

"ASHLAND, 3d October, 1851.

"GENTLEMEN—

"I have duly received your official letter, transmitting an address, numerously signed by my fellow-citizens of New York, inviting me to visit that city, and address a public meeting on some of the public and exciting topics of the day; and you are pleased to add an expression of your own kind wishes that I would accept the invitation. I should be most happy, if I felt myself in a condition to do so; but, for the reasons assigned in my answer to the address, which is herewith forwarded, I am very sorry that it is not in my power to accept it. I hope that answer may be deemed satisfactory by you, and by those whom you represent.

"I have the honor to be, gentlemen, with high respect, Your obedient servant, "H. CLAY.

"To Messrs. GEO. GRISWOLD, STEPHEN WHITNEY,
A. C. KINGSLAND, CHAS. M. LEUPP, and JAS.
DE P. OGDEN, &c., &c."

The following is the answer to the address so numerously signed:

ASHLAND, 3d October, 1851.

"GENTLEMEN—

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, yesterday, of the address which you transmitted to me, from a number of gentlemen in the city of New York. Emanating from a source so highly respectable and imposing, from friends and fellow-citizens so numerous and intelligent, and to whom I am under such great obligations, I have perused it with profound attention and deference. After adverting to the present state of public affairs, to the spirit adverse to the measures of compromise adopted during the last Congress, which prevails in certain quarters, to the necessity of unremitted exertions to preserve our glorious Union, and to what has been so seasonably and well done, with so much ability, eloquence and patriotism, by some of our eminent countrymen, you invite me to leave, for a time, my quiet abode here, to appear in your great city, and to address my fellow-citizens on the actual condition, and menacing danger of our country.

"I feel, gentlemen, with the greatest interest and the deepest solicitude, the full force of all that you have expressed; and I would gladly comply with your wishes, and even dedicate the remnant of a life, the largest and best part of which has been spent in the public service, to the cause of the Union, if the state of my health would allow me, and if I believed that any fresh exertions of mine would be useful. But ever since the long session of the last Congress, during which my arduous duties were greater than I was well able to encounter, my health has been delicate, and it has remained so throughout the past summer. I hope that it is improving, but it still requires the most assiduous care; and I entertain serious apprehensions that if I were to accept your invitation, and throw myself into the scenes of excitement incident to it, my strength might fail me, and my present debility might be much increased. There is no place, I am fully aware, where I should find more ardent and enthusiastic friends in one party, and more courtesy and respect in the other, than in the commercial metropolis of the Union. While I am constrained, with much regret, respectfully to decline the meeting you propose, I avail myself of the occasion to present some views which I have taken of public affairs, and which I trust may be received as a substitute for any oral exhibition of them, which I could make before a large concourse of my fellow-citizens in New York.

"It was not supposed by the authors and supporters of the compromise, in the last Congress, that the adoption of the series of measures which composed it, would secure the unanimous concurrence of all. Their reasonable hopes were confined to the great majority of the people of the United States, and their hopes have not been disappointed. Everywhere, north, south, east and west, an immense majority of the people are satisfied with, or acquiesce in, the compromise. This may be confidently asserted in regard to thirteen of the slave-holding States, and to thirteen, if not fourteen, of the free States. In a few of both classes of the States, and in some particular localities, dissatisfaction exists, exhibiting itself occasionally in words of great violence and intemperance; but this feeling is, I trust, where it has most prevailed, gradually yielding to an enlightened sense of public duty. I will present a rapid survey of the actual state of things, as it appears to me, both at the North and the South, beginning at the former.

"In all that region, there is but one of the various compromise measures that is seriously assailed, and that is the law, made in strict conformity with the Constitution, for the surrender of fugitives from lawful service or labor. But the law itself, with two exceptions, has been everywhere enforced; opposition to it is constantly abating, and the patriotic obligations of obeying the Constitution and the laws, made directly or indirectly by the people themselves, are now almost universally recognized and admitted. If, in the execution of the law, by the public authority, popular discontent is sometimes manifested, it has, with the exceptions mentioned, been invariably repressed, or prevented from obstructing the officers of justice in the performance of their official duties. If I am correctly informed, a

great and salutary change has been made, and is yet in progress, at the North, which authorizes the confident anticipation that reason and law will finally achieve a noble triumph.

"The necessity of maintaining and enforcing that law, unrepealed, and without any modification that would seriously impair its efficiency, must be admitted by the impartial judgment of all candid men. Many of the slave-holding States, and many public meetings of the people in them, have deliberately declared that their adherence to the Union depended upon the preservation of that law, and that its abandonment would be the signal of the dissolution of the Union. I know that the abolitionists (some of whom openly avow a desire to produce that calamitous event), and their partizans deny and deride the existence of any such danger; but men who will not perceive and own it, must be blind to the signs of the times, to the sectional strife which has unhappily arisen, to the embittered feelings which have been excited, as well as the solemn resolutions of deliberative assemblies, unanimously adopted. Their disregard of the danger, I am apprehensive, proceeds more from their desire to continue agitation, which augments it, than from their love of the Union itself.

"You refer, gentlemen, to 'resolutions and addresses adopted at conventions lately assembled around us, in which we have seen with regret as well as alarm, that the question of adherence to the compromise is avoided or evaded,' and you justly deprecate the tendency of these resolutions. I have not been an inattentive or indifferent observer of them, and with you I deeply regret their adoption. I wish that these respectable bodies could have been less ambiguous, and more explicit, in declaring their determination to acquiesce in, and abide by, a great measure of peace and compromise, which, forming an epoch in the progress of our country, was intended to reconcile and restore concord and fraternal feelings among our divided countrymen. There was no necessity to reserve a right to discuss, to modify and to repeal the obnoxious law. Such a right existed without any express reservation, not only as to that law, but as to all laws, and as to the Constitution itself, which has incorporated in it the right of amendment, and consequently that of discussion. But there are occasions when a spirit of moderation should prompt a forbearance to exercise that right. If more were intended than meets the eye, more than to proclaim the theoretic right of discussion, if it were designed to announce the right of unremitted agitation, to continue the distractions of the country, and, finally, if possible, to repeal the fugitive slave law, patriotism and harmony must condemn the unwise course, as fraught with the most mischievous and perilous consequences.

"But we must make some allowance for human frailty and inordinate pride of opinion. Many persons at the North had avowed an invincible hostility to the fugitive slave law; and even declared their intention forcibly to obstruct its execution, and had appealed to a higher law, which, as they contended, was paramount to all human legislation. These untenable positions were wholly irreconcilable with patriotism, or even with the ex-

istence of regular government itself. Obeying the dictates, it is to be hoped, of wiser and purer, and more social counsels, the parties who, under the impulses of passion and fanaticism, had assumed, have now abandoned them, and acknowledged their unquestionable duty to submit to the law, until it is modified or repealed by competent authority. In descending from the high and perilous ground which they could not safely occupy, to that of conceding the obligation of submission to the law, we discern, I hope, a just homage to the dictates of civilization, and to the duties of established government. If they have coupled with this proper concession the useless reservation of a right of discussion, and of insisting upon a repeal or amendment of a law to which they had taken exception, may we not hope that their purpose was only to secure a decent retreat, with a secret and patriotic determination to forbear from disturbing that return to harmony and tranquillity, so necessary to the safety and prosperity of the Union? Should it turn out otherwise, should the reckless spirit of agitation continue to disturb and distract our country, to array section against section, and to threaten the stability of the government, my confidence is unshaken in the great body of our Northern fellow-citizens, that they will, in due time, and in a right manner, apply an appropriate and effectual corrective.

"In turning our attention to the South, and to the slave-holding States, we behold enough to encourage the friends of the Union, and but little to excite solicitude and alarm. In all those States, except three, there is acquiescence in the terms of the compromise, and a firm attachment to the Union. In two of those three (Georgia and Mississippi), we have much reason to hope, from their known patriotism and intelligence, that the same attachment exists, on the part of large majorities of the people. At all events, those among them, of whose devotion and fidelity to the Union serious apprehensions were entertained, have been constrained, in deference to public opinion, materially to change their principles, and to go to the polls upon a new issue. They have renounced and denounced the practical right of secession at present, and taken shelter under the convenient mask of the mere abstract right. Whether this shifting of position will satisfy the people of those two States, remains to be seen. They will doubtless seriously consider, that there is but a short step between the theoretic assertion, and the practical exercise of that right; and in a contingency, neither remote nor improbable, if they affirm the right, they may be soon called upon to involve themselves in all the calamitous evils of a civil war.

"South Carolina alone furnishes at present occasion for profound regret and serious apprehension, not so much for the security of the Union as for her own peace and prosperity. We are compelled, painfully and reluctantly, to yield to the force of concurring evidence, establishing that there exists in that State general dissatisfaction with, and a general desire to withdraw from, the Union; and that both parties—that which is for separate State action, and that which insists upon the necessity of the co

operation of other States—equally agree as to the expediency of secession, and differ only in the degree of rashness or prudence which characterizes them respectively.

"Nullification and secession have sprung from the same metaphysical school; and the latter is the ally, if not the offspring of the former. They both agree that a single State is invested with power to nullify the laws of all the other States, passed by Congress; but nullification claims a right to accomplish that object, and to remain at the same time in the Union; while secession asserts a right to attain it, by withdrawing from the Union, and absolving the State from all obligation to the Constitution and laws of the United States. They both maintain that a resort to either process is peaceful and legitimate. Nullification derived an ambiguous but contested support from the memorable resolutions of the States of Virginia and Kentucky, adopted in 1798–99; but those resolutions afford no color or countenance to the pretensions of secession.

"The doctrine of secession assumes, that any one of the thirty-one States composing the Union, wherever or however situated, whether in the interior or on the frontier, has a right, upon its own separate will, and according to the dictates of its exclusive judgment, to withdraw from the Union whenever it pleases; that this act of secession is peaceful, and not to be controverted or obstructed by the rest of the States, or by the application of any force, within the limits of the seceding State, to execute the laws of the United States; and that, thereupon, the State and its citizens are absolved from all obligations and duties to the United States, and become a power as independent and sovereign as any of the nations of the earth. The doctrine maintains that this right of secession may be exercised whenever the State deems it has sufficient cause; at all times—in a state of profound peace and prosperity, or in the midst of a furious war, raging in all our borders; and that, in the latter case, transforming itself into a distinct and independent nation, it may escape the calamities of war, make a separate treaty of peace with the common enemy, become neutral, or even ally itself with that enemy, and take up arms against the United States. It asserts this right, although it may lead, in process of time, to the promiscuous dotting over, upon the surface of the territory of the United States, of petty independent nations, establishing for themselves any form of government, free or despotic, known to mankind, and interrupting the intercourse and violating or menacing the execution of the laws of the dismembered confederacy. It contends for this right, as well for Louisiana as for South Carolina, although the province of Louisiana cost us so much money, and was nigh involving us in a foreign war; for Texas, although it occasioned us a war with Mexico, the payment of ten millions of dollars to arrange its boundaries, and to acquire it, many were willing to risk a war with England; and for distant California, although that was acquired by the double title of conquest and the payment of an ample pecuniary consideration.

"If, indeed, the Union, under which we have so long, and generally so

happily lived, be thus fragile, and liable to crumble into pieces, we must cease to boast of the wisdom of our forefathers who formed it, tear from our hearts the sentiments of gratitude and veneration with which they had inspired us, and no longer expect an enlightened world to bestow the unbounded praise which it has hitherto lavished on them. A doctrine so extraordinary and indefensible, fraught with the destruction of the Union, and such other direful consequences, finds no encouragement or support in the Constitution of the United States. It has none under the articles of confederation which formed, in terms, a perpetual Union, however otherwise weak and inefficient the government was which they established. That inefficiency arose out of the fact, that it operated not on the people directly, but upon the States, which might, and often did, fail to comply with the requisitions made on them by Congress. To correct that defect, and to form a more *perfect* Union, the present Constitution was adopted. It had been alleged, that the Union of the States, under the articles of confederation, was held together only by a rope of sand; but it was a rope of adamant, compared with the cord which now binds us, if the right of secession is sanctioned and sustained.

"The Constitution of the United States establishes a government, and, like all governments, it was to be perpetual, or to have unlimited duration. It was not restricted to the existing generation, but comprehended posterity. The preamble declares, that 'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more *perfect Union*, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our *posterity*, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.' It makes provision expressly for the admission of new States into the Union; but from the beginning to the end of it, not a clause is to be found which gives any authority or color to the right of secession of a State once admitted into the Union.

"The partisans of this novel and strange doctrine attempt to support it on two grounds: First, they contend that by an express amendment of the Constitution, as all powers not granted to the government of the United States are reserved to the States, or to the people, the power or right of secession is not granted, and that it is therefore retained by the States and the people, and may be exercised at their pleasure.

"This argument is refuted by either of two sufficient answers. The contested power can not be retained, if its reservation be incompatible with the obligations of the constitutional compact. But the Constitution was intended to be perpetual, or which is the same thing, to be of unlimited existence, subject only, from time to time, to such amendments as might be made, in the mode which it specifies. It created a more *perfect Union*, which was to secure the blessings of liberty to the generation which formed it, and to their *posterity*. The obligation which each State voluntarily assumed to the other States, by being admitted into the Union, was, that it would remain perpetually bound with the other States to

preserve that union, for their own benefit, and to inure to the benefit of posterity. To assert in the face of that obligation, that a State may retire from the Union whenever it pleases, is to assert that a party, bound by a solemn compact to other parties, may cancel or violate the compact whenever it thinks proper, without their consent. In order to secure respect and submission to the Union, the Constitution expressly provides, 'that this Constitution, and laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in *every* State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.'

"Thus each and every one of the States has agreed, not only that its ordinary legislation, but that its Constitution, the higher law made by the people themselves in convention, shall, in any cases of conflict, be subordinate to the paramount authority of the Constitution, laws made in pursuance thereof, and treaties of the United States. If, therefore, any State were, either in its legislature, or in a convention of delegates of the people, to declare, by the most formal act, that it had seceded from the Union, such act would be nugatory and an absolute nullity; and the people of that State would remain bound by the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, as fully and perfectly as if the act had never been proclaimed.

"But there is another view also, conclusive against the pretension of secession being a power reserved to the States under the amendment of the Constitution referred to. The reservation of a power implies its existence in the party reserving it, prior to such reservation. But when a State existed in its independent, separate and unassociated character, it could have had no right of secession, there being no confederacy or other party from which to secede. Secession is incident to union or confederacy, without which it can have no existence, and, unless it is clearly provided for in the compact of the Union, out of which it springs, and still more, if it be utterly irreconcilable with that compact, it can have no constitutional or legitimate foundation.

"It is contended, however, in the second place, that the right of secession appertains to the States, under and in virtue of their sovereignty. This argument scorns any reliance upon the reservation of powers in the Constitution, cuts loose from all the obligations in that instrument, defies the power and authority of the general government, and finds a solution of the authority for secession in the sovereignty of the States. What that sovereignty is, it does not deign to define or explain, nor to show how one of its attributes is to disregard and violate grave compacts.

"The sovereignty of the States, prior to the adoption of the present Constitution, was limited and qualified by the articles of confederation. They had agreed among themselves to create a *perpetual* Union. When, therefore, the thirteen original States passed from under those articles, to the Constitution, they passed from a less to a more perfect Union, and agreed to further limitations upon their sovereignty.

"Under the present Constitution, among the limitations and prohibitions upon the sovereignty of the States, it is expressly provided, that 'no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation, grant letters of marque and reprisal, coin money, emit bills of credit, make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; and no State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will admit of no delay.' It may be affirmed, with entire truth, that all the attributes of sovereignty which relate to peace and war, commerce, navigation, friendship and intercourse with, and, in short, all that relate to foreign powers, and several of those attributes which relate to the internal administration of the States themselves, are voluntarily surrendered to the general government, and can not be exercised by the States. The performance of any of the forbidden acts would be null and void, no matter in what solemn and authentic form, nor by what State authority, the legislature, a convention, or the people themselves of the State, in an aggregate mass, it might be performed. The Constitution of the United States would instantly intervene, vacate the act, and proclaim the overruling, supreme and paramount authority of the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States.

"It is clear, therefore, that no State can do any thing repugnant to the Constitution, laws and treaties of the United States. What it might do, if it were in possession of all its absolute sovereignty, and had never entered into this Union, is a different question. But if we suppose, contrary to the historical fact, that the States were absolutely sovereign, when the existing Constitution was adopted, could they circumscribe and contract their attributes of sovereignty, by the stipulations and provisions which are contained in it? All history is full of examples of the total annihilation of sovereignty or nationality, oftener by the power of the sword and conquest, but sometimes by the voluntary act of one nation, merging itself into another, of which we have a striking instance in the case of Texas, in our own country. Assuming that the Constitution is a mere compact between independent nations, or sovereign States, they are, nevertheless, bound by all the obligations which the compact creates. They are bound to abstain from all forbidden acts, and to submit to the supremacy of the Constitution and laws of the United States. But, it will be asked, have they not also the right to judge of the fidelity with which the common government has adhered to the common compact? Yes, most certainly. They have that right, and so has every citizen of the United States, and so has the general government also. The alleged violation of the Constitution may be exposed and denounced by all the weapons of reason, of argument, and of ridicule; by remonstrance, protest, appeals to the judiciary, and to the other States; by the press, public opinion, and all legitimate means of persuading or influencing it. If, after the employment of all or any of these peaceful methods, the government of the United States, sus-

tained by a constitutional majority of the nation, persist in retaining the obnoxious law, there is no alternative but obedience to the law, on the part of the minority, or open, undisguised, manly and forcible resistance to its execution.

"The alleged right of secession is, I apprehend, sometimes confounded with a right of revolution. But its partizans mean a totally different thing. They contend that it is a peaceful, lawful, and, if not constitutional remedy, that it is not forbidden by the Constitution. They insist that it is a State right, to be recognized and respected; and, that whenever exercised by a State, far from being censured or condemned, the State, if necessary, is entitled to the co-operation of other States. The prudent valor of these partizans, in imitation of the previous example of the friends of nullification, disclaims the purpose of using themselves, and protest against the application to them of any physical force.

"The right of revolution is that right, which an unjustly oppressed people, threatened with, or borne down by intolerable and insupportable tyranny and injustice, have, of resorting to forcible resistance, to prevent or redress the wrongs with which they are menaced, or under which they are suffering. It may aim simply at the removal of grievances, or it may seek totally to change the existing government, or to establish within its limits a new government. It is a right not confined by the boundaries of States, (although being organized political bodies, they may be capable of giving greater effect to revolutionary efforts), but it belongs to oppressed man, whatever may be his condition. In all revolutions, however, there are two parties, those who revolt, and the government which they forcibly resist. There are generally two opposite opinions also, entertained of the cause of resistance: that of those who rise in rebellion, believing themselves to be wronged, and that of the existing government, which denies having inflicted any oppression or injustice. It is incumbent upon wise and considerate men, before they hastily engage in a revolution, deliberately to consider the motives and causes of revolt, and carefully to calculate the probable consequences of forcible resistance. If unsuccessful, they know that they will be guilty of treason, and incur the penalty inflicted upon traitors.

"I have thus, gentlemen, presented an imperfect sketch of some of the views which I have taken of the existing topics of the day. It would admit of much enlargement and additional illustration, but I have already given to this paper an inordinate length. In contemplating that sketch, we behold much more to animate the hopes and to encourage the patriotism of the country, than to create regret and apprehension. After such a political storm as that which violently raged during the last Congress, it was not to be expected that the nation would instantly settle down in perfect quiet and repose. Considering the vast extent of our territory, our numerous population, the heated conflicts of passion, of opinion, of interests and of sections, pervading the entire Union, we have great reason to be thankful to Providence for the degree of calmness, of tranquility, and

of satisfaction, which prevails. If there are local exceptions at the North and at the South, of rash and misguided men, who would madly resist the Constitution and laws of the United States, let us not despair of their return, in seasonable time, to reason and to duty. But suppose we should be disappointed, and that the standard should be raised of open resistance to the Union, the Constitution and the laws, what is to be done? There can be but one possible answer. The power, the authority and dignity of the government ought to be maintained, and resistance put down at every hazard. Government, in the fallen and depraved state of man, would lose all respect, and fall into disgrace and contempt, if it did not possess potentially, and would not, in extreme cases, practically exercise the right of employing force. The theory of the Constitution of the United States assumes the necessity of the existence and the application of force, both in our foreign and domestic relations. Congress is expressly authorized 'to raise and support armies,' 'to provide and maintain a navy,' and 'to provide for calling forth the militia, to *execute* the laws of the Union, *suppress insurrections* and repel invasions.' The duty of executing the laws and suppressing insurrections, is without limitation or qualification; it is coextensive with the jurisdiction of the United States, and it comprehends every species of resistance to the execution of the laws, and every form of insurrection, no matter under what auspices or sanction it is made. Individuals, public meetings, States, may resolve, as often as their tastes or passion may prompt them to resolve, that they will forcibly oppose the execution of the laws, and secede from the Union. While these resolutions remain on paper, they are harmless; but the moment a daring hand is raised to resist, by force, the execution of the laws, the duty of enforcing them arises, and if the conflict which may ensue should lead to civil war, the resisting party, having begun it, will be responsible for all the consequences.

"Since the adoption of our present Constitution, and the Union which it created, by the blessing of Providence, we have advanced in population, power, wealth, internal improvement, and national greatness, with a degree of rapidity which, unparalleled in ancient or modern nations, has excited the astonishment and commanded the admiration of mankind. Our ample limits and extensive jurisdiction, more than tripled, have been made to embrace all the provinces of Louisiana, the two Floridas, Texas and New Mexico; and passing the Rocky Mountains, have reached the Pacific Ocean, comprehending Oregon, and California, and Utah. Our population has risen from four to twenty-three millions; our revenue, without any onerous burden, has grown from less than three to near fifty millions of dollars; our revolutionary debt is extinguished; our mercantile marine is not surpassed by that of the greatest maritime power; the abundant products of our agriculture, satisfy all our wants, and contribute to the subsistence of other nations; our manufactures are rapidly tending to the supply of all we essentially need from them, and to afford a surplus for the prosecution of our extended foreign commerce; the surface of our land is

striped over with railroads and turnpikes, and our sea lakes and navigable waters resound with the roar of innumerable steam vessels. Your own great city illustrates our surprising progress. After the commencement of the operation of this Constitution, in 1790, its population was 33,131. By the census of 1850, it was 515,394, and our other cities have increased in scarcely a less ratio. The problem of the capacity of representative government to maintain free and liberal institutions, on an extensive territory, has been triumphantly solved by the intelligence of the people, and the all-powerful agency of steam and lightning.

"Such are the gratifying results which have been obtained under the auspices of that Union, which some rash men, prompted by ambition, passion and frenzy, would seek to dissolve and subvert! To revolt against such a government, for any thing which has passed, would be so atrocious, and characterized by such extreme folly and madness, that we may search in vain for an example of it in human annals. We can look for its prototype only (if I may be pardoned the allusion) to that diabolical revolt which, recorded on the pages of Holy Writ, has been illustrated and commemorated by the sublime genius of the immortal Milton.

"In conclusion, gentlemen, let us enjoy the proud consolation afforded by the conviction that a vast majority of the people of the United States, true to their forefathers, true to themselves, and true to posterity, are firmly and immovably attached to this Union; that they see in it a safe and sure, if not the sole guaranty of liberty, of internal peace, of prosperity, and of national happiness, progress and greatness; that its dissolution would be followed by endless wars among ourselves, by the temptation or invitation to foreign powers to take part in them, and finally, by foreign subjugation, or the establishment of despotism; and that 'united we stand—divided we fall.'

"I am, with the highest respect,
"Your obedient servant,
"H. CLAY.

"To Messrs. STEPHEN WHITNEY, GEO. GRISWOLD, DANIEL ULLMANN, and the other signers of the Address."

NOTE E—Page 255.

We have not been disposed to attach party designations to the names of the senators, who, in their places, pronounced eulogies on the life and character of Mr. Clay the day after his death, as cited in the text. The speakers were equally divided between the two great parties; but there was no party feeling. So far as party politics are concerned, Mr. Clay did not come to his end as a party man, but as an American Patriot, which all of both parties felt, perhaps equally; and the tributes of respect paid to him by the Democrats, after he was dead, were doubtless equally sincere as those rendered by the Whigs. Mr. Clay, as we have had occasion to observe in these pages, was always a national man; but the efforts he made to bring about the Compromise of 1850, disarmed the party feeling of his former political opponents, in Congress and throughout the country, and he died equally lamented by all. All of both parties, apparently, were disposed to render equal honors to his name. They seemed to rival each other in doing justice to the great American Patriot, and in claiming a common property in his fame. It was not simply the effect of the subduing power of the great destroyer, though this, undoubtedly, had its influence; but it was a sincere respect for the man. He left the theater of his great earthly exploits admired, loved, and lamented by all. As in the Senate, so also in the House of Representatives, his eulogists were equally divided between the two great parties of the nation, and no one would know from the remarks of the speakers, to which party they belonged, except incidentally disclosed by some of them.

There is not only a special interest in these speeches on such an occasion, but they are especially pertinent to our general purpose, as they exhibit the life and character of Mr. Clay in many points of view peculiarly fresh and glowing, as coming up from

the heart, at the same time that they revive and record historical recollections of interest and value. Take them as a whole, they are an epitome of the life and character of Mr. Clay, and from this body of evidence alone, a total stranger to Mr. Clay's history would have a very tolerable idea of it. It is a chapter of its own kind, and essential to the completeness of the picture—brief, condensed, and replete with eloquent thought. It is the last act of the drama—not tragical, but yet having all the interest of such an exhibition, because the hand of death is in it.

In the House of Representatives, July 30, 1852, a message was received from the Senate by the hands of Asbury Dickens, Esq., its Secretary, announcing the death of Henry Clay, late senator from Kentucky, and the adoption of certain resolutions of that body.

M. BRECKINRIDGE* rose and said:

"Mr. Speaker: I rise to perform the melancholy duty of announcing to this body the death of Henry Clay, late a senator in Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"Mr. Clay expired at his lodgings in this city yesterday morning, at seventeen minutes past eleven o'clock, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. His noble intellect was unclouded to the last. After protracted sufferings, he passed away without pain; and so gently did the spirit leave his frame, that the moment of departure was not observed by the friends who watched at his bedside. His last hours were cheered by the presence of an affectionate son, and he died surrounded by friends who, during his long illness, had done all that affection could suggest to soothe his sufferings.

"Although this sad event has been expected for many weeks, the shock it produced, and the innumerable tributes of respect to his memory exhibited on every side, and in every form, prove the depth of the public sorrow and the greatness of the public loss.

"Imperishably associated as his name has been for fifty years with every great event affecting the fortunes of our country, it is difficult to realize that he is indeed gone forever. It is difficult to feel that we shall see no more his noble form within these walls—that we shall hear no more his patriot tones, now rousing his countrymen to vindicate their rights against a foreign foe, now imploring them to preserve concord among themselves. We shall see him no more. The memory and the fruits of his services alone remain to us. Amid the general gloom, the Capitol itself looks desolate, as if the genius of the place had departed. Already the intelligence has reached almost every quarter of the Republic, and a great people mourn with us, to-day, the death of their most illustrious

* J. C. Beckinridge, of Kentucky.

citizen. Sympathizing, as we do, deeply, with his family and friends, yet private affliction is absorbed in the general sorrow. The spectacle of a whole community lamenting the loss of a great man, is far more touching than any manifestation of private grief. In speaking of a loss which is national, I will not attempt to describe the universal burst of grief with which Kentucky will receive these tidings. The attempt would be vain to depict the gloom that will cover her people, when they know that the pillar of fire has been removed which has guided their footsteps for the life of a generation.

"It is known to the country that, from the memorable session of 1849–'50, Mr. Clay's health gradually declined. Although several years of his senatorial term remained, he did not propose to continue in the public service longer than the present session. He came to Washington chiefly to defend, if it should become necessary, the measures of Adjustment, to the adoption of which he so largely contributed; but the condition of his health did not allow him, at any time, to participate in the discussions of the Senate. During the winter he was confined almost wholly to his room, with slight changes in his condition, but gradually losing the remnant of his strength. During the long and dreary winter, he conversed much and cheerfully with his friends, and expressed a deep interest in public affairs. Although he did not expect a restoration to health, he cherished the hope that the mild season of the spring would bring to him strength enough to return to Ashland, and die in the bosom of his family. But alas! spring that brings life to all nature, brought no life nor hope to him. After the month of March, his vital powers rapidly wasted, and for weeks he lay patiently awaiting the stroke of death. But the approach of the destroyer had no terrors for him. No clouds overhung his future. He met the end with composure, and his pathway to the grave was brightened by the immortal hopes which spring from the Christian faith.

"Not long before his death, having just returned from Kentucky, I bore to him a token of affection from his excellent wife. Never can I forget his appearance, his manner, or his words. After speaking of his family, his friends, and his country, he changed the conversation to his own future, and looking on me with his fine eye undimmed, and his voice full of its original compass and melody, he said, 'I am not afraid to die, sir. I have hope, faith, and some confidence. I do not think any man can be entirely certain in regard to his future state, but I have an abiding trust in the merits and mediation of our Saviour.' It will assuage the grief of his family to know that he looked hopefully beyond the tomb, and a Christian people will rejoice to hear that such a man in his last hours reposed with simplicity and confidence on the promises of the Gospel.

"It is the custom, on occasions like this, to speak of the parentage and childhood of the deceased, and to follow him, step by step, through life. I will not attempt to relate even all the great events of Mr. Clay's life, be-

cause they are familiar to the whole country, and it would be needless to enumerate a long list of public services which form a part of American history.

"Beginning life as a friendless boy, with few advantages save those conferred by nature, while yet a minor he left Virginia, the State of his birth, and commenced the practice of law at Lexington, in Kentucky. At a bar remarkable for its numbers and talent, Mr. Clay soon rose to the first rank. At a very early age, he was elected from the county of Fayette to the General Assembly of Kentucky, and was the Speaker of that body. Coming into the Senate of the United States, for the first time, in 1806, he entered upon a parliamentary career, the most brilliant and successful in our annals. From that time, he remained habitually in the public eye. As a senator, as a member of this House, and its Speaker, as a representative of his country abroad, and as a high officer in the Executive department of the Government, he was intimately connected for fifty years with every great measure of American policy. Of the mere party measures of this period, I do not propose to speak. Many of them have passed away, and are remembered only as the occasion for the great intellectual efforts which marked their discussion. Concerning others, opinions are still divided. They will go into history, with the reasons on either side rendered by the greatest intellects of the time.

"As a leader in a deliberative body, Mr. Clay had no equal in America. In him, intellect, person, eloquence, and courage, united to form a character fit to command. He fired with his own enthusiasm, and controlled by his amazing will, individuals and masses. No reverse could crush his spirit, nor defeat reduce him to despair. Equally erect and dauntless in prosperity and adversity, when successful he moved to the accomplishment of his purposes with severe resolution; when defeated, he rallied his broken bands around him, and from his eagle-eye shot along their ranks the contagion of his own courage. Destined for a leader, he everywhere asserted his destiny. In his long and eventful life, he came in contact with men of all ranks and professions, but he never felt that he was in the presence of a man superior to himself. In the assemblies of the people, at the bar, in the Senate—everywhere within the circle of his personal presence, he assumed and maintained a position of pre-eminence.

"But the supremacy of Mr. Clay as a party leader, was not his only nor his highest title to renown. That title is to be found in the purely patriotic spirit which, on great occasions, always signalized his conduct. We have had no statesman who, in periods of real and imminent public peril, has exhibited a more genuine and enlarged patriotism than Henry Clay. Whenever a question presented itself actually threatening the existence of the Union, Mr. Clay, rising above the passions of the hour, always exerted his powers to solve it peacefully and honorably. Although more liable than most men, from his impetuous and ardent nature, to feel strongly the passions common to us all, it was his rare faculty to be able to subdue them

in a great crisis, and to hold toward all sections of the Confederacy the language of concord and brotherhood.

"Sir, it will be a proud pleasure to every true American heart to remember the great occasions when Mr. Clay has displayed a sublime patriotism—when the ill-temper engendered by the times, and the miserable jealousies of the day, seemed to have been driven from his bosom by the expulsive power of nobler feelings—when every throb of his heart was given to his country, every effort of his intellect dedicated to her service. Who does not remember the three periods when the American system of government was exposed to its severest trials; and who does not know that when History shall relate the struggles which preceded the dangers which were averted by the Missouri Compromise, the Tariff Compromise of 1833, and the Adjustment of 1850, the same pages will record the genius, the eloquence, and the patriotism of Henry Clay?

"Nor was it in Mr. Clay's nature to lag behind until measures of adjustment were matured, and then come forward to swell a majority. On the contrary, like a bold and real statesman, he was ever among the first to meet the peril, and hazard his fame upon the remedy. It is fresh in the memory of us all that, when lately the fury of sectional discord threatened to sever the Confederacy, Mr. Clay, though withdrawn from public life, and oppressed by the burden of years, came back to the Senate, the theater of his glory, and devoted the remnant of his strength to the sacred duty of preserving the union of the States.

"With characteristic courage, he took the lead in proposing a scheme of settlement. But, while he was willing to assume the responsibility of proposing a plan, he did not, with petty ambition, insist upon its adoption to the exclusion of other modes; but, taking his own as a starting-point for discussion and practical action, he nobly labored with his compatriots to change and improve it in such form as to make it an acceptable adjustment. Throughout the long and arduous struggle, the love of country expelled from his bosom the spirit of selfishness, and Mr. Clay proved, for the third time, that though he was ambitious, and loved glory, he had no ambition to mount to fame on the confusions of his country. And this conviction is lodged in the hearts of the people; the party measures and the party passions of former times have not, for several years, interposed between Mr. Clay and the masses of his countrymen. After 1850, he seemed to feel that his mission was accomplished, and during the same period, the regards and affections of the American people have been attracted to him in a remarkable degree. For many months the warmest feelings, the deepest anxieties, of all parties centered upon the dying statesman; the glory of his great actions shed a mellow luster on his declining years, and to fill the measure of his fame, his countrymen, weaving for him the laurel wreath, with common hands did bind it about his venerable brows, and send him, crowned, to history.

"The life of Mr. Clay, sir, is a striking example of the abiding fame

which surely awaits the direct and candid statesman. The entire absence of equivocation or disguise in all his acts, was his master-key to the popular heart; for while the people will forgive the errors of a bold and open nature, he sins past forgiveness who deliberately deceives them. Hence Mr. Clay, though often defeated in his measures of policy, always secured the respect of his opponents without losing the confidence of his friends. He never paltered in a double sense. The country never was in doubt as to his opinions or his purposes. In all the contests of his time, his position on great public questions was as clear as the sun in the cloudless sky. Sir, standing by the grave of this great man, and considering these things, how contemptible does appear the mere legerdemain of politics! What a reproach is his life on that false policy which would trifle with a great and upright people! If I were to write his epitaph, I would inscribe, as the highest eulogy, on the stone which shall mark his resting-place, 'Here lies a man who was in the public service for fifty years, and never attempted to deceive his countrymen.'

"While the youth of America should imitate his noble qualities, they may take courage from his career, and note the high proof it affords that, under our equal institutions, the avenues to honor are open to all. Mr. Clay rose by the force of his own genius, unaided by power, patronage, or wealth. At an age when our young men are usually advanced to the higher schools of learning, provided only with the rudiments of an English education, he turned his steps to the West, and, amid the rude collisions of a border life, matured a character whose highest exhibitions were destined to mark eras in his country's history. Beginning on the frontiers of American civilization, the orphan boy, supported only by the consciousness of his own powers, and by the confidence of the people, surmounted all the barriers of adverse fortune, and won a glorious name in the annals of his country. Let the generous youth, fired with honorable ambition, remember that the American system of government offers on every hand bounties to merit. If, like Clay, orphanage, obscurity, poverty, shall oppress him; yet if, like Clay, he feels the Promethean spark within, let him remember that his country, like a generous mother, extends her arms to welcome and to cherish every one of her children whose genius and worth may promote her prosperity or increase her renown.

"Mr. Speaker, the signs of woe around us, and the general voice, announce that another great man has fallen. Our consolation is that he was not taken in the vigor of his manhood, but sunk into the grave at the close of a long and illustrious career. The great statesmen who have filled the largest space in the public eye, one by one, are passing away. Of the three great leaders of the Senate, one alone remains, and he must follow soon. We shall witness no more their intellectual struggles in the American forum; but the monuments of their genius will be cherished as the common property of the people, and their names will continue to confer dignity and renown upon their country.

"Not less illustrious than the greatest of these will be the name of Clay—a name pronounced with pride by Americans in every quarter of the globe; a name to be remembered while history shall record the struggles of modern Greece for freedom, or the spirit of liberty burn in the South American bosom; a living and immortal name—a name that would descend to posterity without the aid of letters, borne by tradition from generation to generation. Every memorial of such a man will possess a meaning and a value to his countrymen. His tomb will be a hallowed spot. Great memories will cluster there, and his countrymen, as they visit it, may well exclaim—

"'Such graves as his are pilgrim shrines,
Shrines to no creed confined;
The Delphian vales, the Palestines,
The Meccas of the mind.'

"Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States has received, with the deepest sensibility, intelligence of the death of Henry Clay.

"*Resolved*, That the officers and members of the House of Representatives will wear the usual badge of mourning for thirty days, as a testimony of the profound respect this House entertains for the memory of the deceased.

"*Resolved*, That the officers and members of the House of Representatives, in a body, will attend the funeral of Henry Clay, on the day appointed for that purpose by the Senate of the United States.

"*Resolved*, That the proceedings of this House, in relation to the death of Henry Clay, be communicated to the family of the deceased by the Clerk.

"*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect for the memory of the deceased, this House do now adjourn."

REMARKS OF MR. EWING.*

Mr. Ewing rose and said: "A noble heart has ceased to beat forever. A long life of brilliant and self-devoted public service is finished at last, and we now stand at its conclusion, looking back through the changeful history of that life to its beginning, cotemporaneous with the very birth of the Republic, and its varied events mingled in our hearts and our memories—with the triumph and calamities, the weakness and the power, the adversity and prosperity of a country we love so much. As we contemplate this sad event in this place, the shadows of the past gather over us; the memories of events long gone crowd upon us, and the shades of departed patriots seem to hover about us, waiting to receive into their midst the spirit of one who is worthy to be a co-laborer with them in a common cause, and to share in the rewards of their virtues. Henceforth he must be to us as one of them.

"They say he was ambitious. If so, it was a grievous fault, and grievously has he answered it. He has found in it naught but disappointment. It has but served to aggravate the mortification of his defeats, and furnish

* Presley Ewing, of Kentucky.

an additional luster to the triumph of his foes. Those who come after us may, ay, they will, inquire why his statue stands not among the statues of those whom men thought ablest and worthiest to govern?

"But his ambition was a high and holy feeling, unselfish, magnanimous. Its aspirations were for his country's good, and its triumph was his country's prosperity. Whether in honor or reproach, in triumph or defeat, that heart of his never throbbed with one pulsation save for her honor and her welfare. Turn to him in that last, best deed, and crowning glory of a life so full of public service and of honor, when his career of personal ambition was finished forever. Rejected again and again by his countrymen; just abandoned by a party which would scarce have had an existence without his genius, his courage, and his labors, that great heart, ever firm and defiant to the assaults of his enemies, but defenseless against the ingratitude of friends, doubtless wrung with the bitterest mortification of his life; then it was, and under such circumstances as these, the gathering storm rose upon his country. All eyes turned to him; all voices called for those services which, in the hour of prosperity, and security, they had so carelessly rejected. With no misanthropic chagrin, with no morose, selfish resentment, he forgot all but his country and that country endangered. He returns to the scene of his labors and his fame, which he had thought to have left forever. A scene—that American Senate-Chamber, clothed in no gorgeous drapery, shrouded in no superstitious awe or ancient reverence for hereditary power, but to a reflecting American mind more full of interest, of dignity, and of grandeur, than any spot on this broad earth, not made holy by religion's consecrating seal. See him as he enters there, tremblingly, but hopefully, upon the last, most momentous, perhaps most doubtful conflict of his life. Sir, many a gay tournament has been more dazzling to the eye of fancy, more gorgeous and imposing in the display of jewelry and cloth of gold, in the sound of heralds' trumpets, in the grand array of princely beauty and of royal pride. Many a battle-field has trembled beneath a more ostentatious parade of human power, and its conquerors have been crowned with laurels, honored with triumphs, and apotheosized amid the demigods of history; but to the thoughtful, hopeful, philanthropic student of the annals of his race, never was there a conflict in which such dangers were threatened, such hopes imperiled, or the hero of which deserved a warmer gratitude, a nobler triumph, or a prouder monument.

"Sir, from that long, anxious, and exhausting conflict he never rose again. In that last battle for his country's honor, and his country's safety, he received the mortal wound which laid him low; and we now mourn the death of a martyred patriot.

"But never, in all the grand drama which the story of his life arrays, never has he presented a sublimer or a more touching spectacle than in those last days of his decline and death. Broken with the storms of state, wounded and scathed in many a fiery conflict, that aged, worn, and de-

cayed body, in such a mournful contrast with the never-dying strength of his giant spirit, he seemed a proud and sacred, though a crumbling monument of past glory. Standing among us like some ancient colossal ruin amid the degenerate and more diminutive structures of modern times, its vast proportions magnified by the contrast, he reminded us of those days when there were giants in the land, and we remembered that even then there was none whose prowess could withstand his arm. To watch him in that slow decline, yielding with dignity, and, as it were, inch by inch, to that last enemy, as a hero yields to a conquering foe, the glorious light of his intellect blazing still in all its wonted brilliancy, and setting at defiance the clouds that vainly attempted to obscure it, he was more full of interest than in the day of his glory and his power. There are some men whose brightest intellectual emanations rise so little superior to the instincts of the animal, that we are led fearfully to doubt that cherished truth of the soul's immortality, which, even in despair, men press to their doubting hearts. But it is in the death of such a man as he that we are re-assured by the contemplation of a kindred though superior spirit, of a soul which, immortal like his fame, knows no old age, no decay, no death.

"The wondrous light of his unmatched intellect may have dazzled a world, the eloquence of that inspired tongue may have enchanted millions, but there are few who have sounded the depths of that noble heart. To see him in sickness and in health, in joy and in sadness, in the silent watches of the night, and in the busy daytime—this it was to know and love him. To see the impetuous torrent of that resistless will; the hurricane of those passions, hushed in peace, breathe calm and gently as a summer zephyr; to feel the gentle pressure of that hand in the grasp of friendship, which in the rage of fiery conflict could hurl scorn and defiance at his foe; to see that eagle eye, which oft would burn with patriotic ardor, or flash with the lightning of his anger, beam with the kindliest expressions of tenderness and affection;—then it was, and then alone, we could learn to know and feel that that heart was warmed by the same sacred fire from above, which enkindled the light of his resplendent intellect. In the death of such a man even patriotism itself might pause, and for a moment stand aloof while friendship shed a tear of sorrow upon his bier.

> "'His life was gentle; and the elements
> So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world, *This was a man!*'

"But who can estimate his country's loss? What tongue portray the desolation which, in this House, throughout this broad land, hangs a gloomy pall over his grief-stricken countrymen? How poorly can words like mine translate the eloquence of a whole people's grief for a patriot's death! For a nation's loss let a nation mourn. For that stupendous calamity to our country and mankind, be the heavens hung with black; let the wailing elements chant his dirge, and the universal heart of man throb with one common pang of grief and anguish."

REMARKS OF MR. CASKIE.*

"Mr Speaker: I must try to lay a single laurel leaf in that open coffin which is already garlanded by the eloquent tributes to the illustrious departed, which have been heard in this now solemn Hall—for I come, sir, from the district of his birth. I represent on this floor that old Hanover so proud of her Henrys—her Patrick Henry, and her Henry Clay. I speak for a people among whom he has always had as earnest and devoted friends as were ever the grace and glory of a patriot and statesman.

"I shall attempt no sketch of his life. That you have had from other and abler hands than mine. Till yesterday that life was, of his own free gift, the property of his country; to-day it belongs to her history. It is known to all, and will not be forgotten. Constant, stern opponent of his political school as has been my State, I say for her, that nowhere in this broad land are his great qualities more admired, or his death more mourned, than in Virginia. Well may this be so; for she is his mother, and he was her son.

"Mr. Speaker, when I remember the party strifes in which he was so much mingled, and through which we all more or less have passed, and then survey this scene, and think how far, as the lightning has borne the news that he is gone, half-masted flags are drooping and church-bells are tolling, and men are sorrowing—I can but feel that it is good for man to die. For when death enters, oh! how the unkindnesses, and jealousies, and rivalries of life do vanish, and how, like incense from an altar, do peace and friendship, and all the sweet charities of our nature, rise around the corpse which was once a man.

"And of truth, Mr. Speaker, never was more of veritable, noble manhood cased in mortal mold than was found in him to whose memory this brief and humble, but true and heartfelt, tribute is paid. But his eloquent voice is hushed, his high heart is stilled. 'Like a shock of corn fully ripe, he has been gathered to his fathers.' With more than threescore years and ten upon him, and honors clustered thick about him, in the full possession of unclouded intellect, and all the consolations of Christianity, he has met the fate which is evitable by none. Lamented by all his countrymen, his name is bright on Fame's immortal roll. He has finished his course, and he has his crown. What more fruit can life bear? What can it give that Henry Clay has not gained?

"Then, Mr. Speaker, around his tomb should be heard not only the dirge that wails his loss, but the jubilant anthem which sounds that on the world's great battle-field another victory has been won, another incontestable greatness achieved."

REMARKS OF MR. CHANDLER.†

"Mr. Speaker: It would seem as if the solemn invocation of the honorable gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Ewing] was receiving an early answer,

* John S. Caskie, of Virginia.

† Joseph R. Chandler, of Pennsylvania.

and that the heavens are hung in black, and the wailing elements are singing the funeral dirge of Henry Clay. Amid this elemental gloom and the distress which pervades the nation at the death of Henry Clay, private grief should not obtrude itself upon notice, nor personal anguish seek for utterance. Silence is the best exponent of individual sorrow, and the heart that knoweth its own bitterness shrinks from an exposition of its affliction.

"Could I have consulted my own feelings on the event which occupies the attention of the House at the present moment, I should even have forborne attendance here, and, in the solitude and silence of my chamber, have mused upon the terrible lesson which has been administered to the people and the nation. But I represent a constituency who justly pride themselves upon the unwavering attachment they have ever felt and manifested to Henry Clay—a constant, pervading, hereditary love; the son has taken up the father's affection, and, amid all the professions of political attachments to others, whom the accidents of party have made prominent, and the success of party has made powerful, true to his own instincts, and true to the sanctified legacy of his father, he has placed the name of Henry Clay forward and pre-eminent as the exponent of what is greatest in statesmanship and purest in patriotism. And even, sir, when party fealty caused other attachments to be avowed for party uses, the preference was limited to the occupancy of office, and superiority admitted for Clay in all that is reckoned above party estimation.

"Nor ought I to forbear to add that, as the senior member of the delegation which represents my Commonwealth, I am requested to utter the sentiments of the people of Pennsylvania at large, who yield to no portion of this great Union in their appreciation of the talents, their reverence for the lofty patriotism, their admiration of the statesmanship, and hereafter their love of the memory of Henry Clay.

"I can not, therefore, be silent on this occasion, without injustice to the affections of my constituency, even though I painfully feel how inadequate to the reverence and love my people have toward that statesman must be all that I have to utter on this occasion.

"I know not, Mr. Chairman, where now the nation is to find the men she needs in peril—either other calls than those of politics are holding in abeyance the talents which the nation may need, or else a generation is to pass undistinguished by the greatness of our statesmen. Of the noble minds that have swayed the Senate, one yet survives in the maturity of powerful intellect, carefully disciplined and nobly exercised. May He who has thus far blessed our nation, spare to her and the world, that of which the world must always envy our country the possession. But my business is with the dead.

"The biography of Henry Clay, from his childhood upward, is too familiar to every American for me to trespass on the time of this House by a reference directly thereto; and the honorable gentlemen who have pre-

ceded me have, with affectionate hand and appropriate delicacy, swept away the dust which nearly fourscore years have scattered over a part of the record, and have made our pride greater in his life, and our grief more poignant at his death, by showing some of those passages which attract respect to our republican institutions, of which Mr. Clay's whole life was the able support and most successful illustration.

"It would, then, be a work of supererogation for me to renew that effort, though inquiry into the life and conduct of Henry Clay would present new themes for private eulogy, new grounds for public gratitude.

"How rare is it, Mr. Speaker, that the great man living, can, with confidence, rely on extensive personal friendship, or, dying, think to awaken a sentiment of regret beyond that which includes the public loss or the disappointment of individual hopes! Yet, sir, the message which yesterday went forth from this city, that Henry Clay was dead, brought sorrow—personal, private, special sorrow—to the hearts of thousands, each of whom felt that from his own love for, his long attachment to, his disinterested hopes in, Henry Clay, he had a particular sorrow to cherish and express, which weighed upon his heart separate from the sense of national loss.

"No man, Mr. Speaker, in our nation had the art so to identify himself with public measures of the most momentous character, and to maintain, at the same time, almost universal affection, like that great statesman. His business, from his boyhood, was with national concerns, and he dealt with them as with familiar things. And yet his sympathies were with individual interests, enterprises, affections, joys, and sorrows; and while every patriot bowed in humble deference to his lofty attainments and heartfelt gratitude for his national services, almost every man in this vast Republic knew that the great statesman was, in feeling and experience, identified with his own position. Hence the universal love of the people; hence their enthusiasm, in all times, for his fame. Hence, sir, their present grief.

"Many other public men of our country have distinguished themselves, and brought honor to the nation, by superiority in some peculiar branch of the public service; but it seems to have been the gift of Mr. Clay to have acquired peculiar eminence in every path of duty he was called to tread. In the earnestness of debate, which great public interests and distinguished opposing talents excited in this House, he had no superior in energy, force, or effect. Yet, as the presiding officer, by blandness of language, and firmness of purpose, he soothed and made orderly; and thus, by official dignity, he commanded the respect which energy had secured to him on the floor.

"Wherever official or social duties demanded an exercise of his powers, there was a preëminence which seemed prescriptively his own. In the lofty debate of the Senate, and the stirring harangues to popular assemblages, he was the orator of the nation and of the people; and the sincerity of purpose and the unity of design evinced in all he said or did, fixed in the public mind a confidence strong and expansive as the affections he had won.

"Year after year, sir, has Henry Clay been achieving the work of the mission with which he was intrusted; and it was only when the warmest wishes of his warmest friends were disappointed, that he entered on the fruition of a patriot's highest hopes, and stood in the full enjoyment of that admiration and confidence which nothing but the antagonism of party relations could have divided.

"How rich that enjoyment must have been, it is only for us to imagine. How eminently deserved it was, we and the world can attest.

"The love and the devotion of his political friends were cheering and grateful to his heart, and were acknowledged in all his life—were recog nized even to his death.

"The contest in the Senate Chamber or the forum was rewarded wit. success achieved, and the great victor could enjoy the ovation which partia. friendship or the gratitude of the benefited prepared. But the triumph of his life was no party achievement. It was not in the applause which admiring friends and defeated antagonists offered to his measureless success that he found the reward of his labors and comprehended the extent of his mission.

"It was only when friends and antagonists paused in their contests, appalled at the public difficulties and national dangers which had been accumulating, unseen and unregarded; it was only when the nation itself felt the danger, and acknowledged the inefficacy of party action as a remedy, that Henry Clay calculated the full extent of his powers, and enjoyed the reward of their saving exercise. Then, sir, you saw, and I saw, party designations dropped, and party allegiance disavowed, and anxious patriots, of all localities and names, turn toward the country's benefactor as the man for the terrible exigences of the hour; and the sick chamber of Henry Clay became the Delphos whence were given out the oracles that presented the means and the measures of our Union's safety. There, sir, and not in the high places of the country, were the labors and sacrifices of half a century to be rewarded and closed. With his right yet in that Senate which he had entered the youngest, and lingered till the eldest, member, he felt that his work was done, and the object of his life accomplished. Every cloud that had dimmed the noonday luster had been dissipated; and the retiring orb, which sunk from the sight of the nation in fullness and in beauty, will yet pour up the horizon a posthumous glory that shall tell of the splendor and greatness of the luminary that has passed away."

REMARKS OF MR. BAYLY.*

"Mr. Speaker: Although I have been all my life a party opponent of Mr. Clay, yet from my boyhood I have been upon terms of personal friendship with him. More than twenty years ago I was introduced to him by my father, who was his personal friend. From that time to this, there has existed between us as great personal intimacy as the disparity in our years

* Thomas H. Bayly, of Virginia.

and our political difference would justify. After I became a member of this House, and upon his return to the Senate, subsequent to his resignation in 1842, the warm regard upon his part for the daughter of a devoted friend of forty years' standing, made him a constant visitor at my house, and frequently a guest at my table. These circumstances make it proper that, upon this occasion, I should pay this last tribute to his memory. I not only knew him well as a statesman, but I knew him better in the most unreserved social intercourse. The most happy circumstance, as I esteem it, of my political life has been, that I have thus known each of our great Congressional triumvirate.

"I, sir, never knew a man of higher qualities than Mr. Clay. His very faults originated in high qualities. With greater self-possession, with greater self-reliance, than any man I ever knew, he possessed moral and physical courage to as high a degree as any man who ever lived. Confident in his own judgment, never doubting as to his own course, fearing no obstacle that might lie in his way, it was almost impossible that he should not have been imperious in his character. Never doubting himself as to what he thought duty and patriotism required at his hands, it was natural that he should sometimes have been impatient with those more doubting and timid than himself. His were qualities to have made a great general, as they were qualities that did make him a great statesman; and these qualities were so obvious that, during the darkest period of our late war with Great Britain, Mr. Madison had determined, at one time, to make him General-in-Chief of the American army.

"Sir, it is but a short time since the American Congress buried the first one that went to the grave of that great triumvirate. We are now called upon to bury another. The third, thank God! still lives, and long may he live to enlighten his countrymen by his wisdom, and set them the example of exalted patriotism. Sir, in the lives and characters of these great men, there is much resembling those of the great triumvirate of the British Parliament. It differs principally in this: Burke preceded Fox and Pitt to the tomb. Webster survives Clay and Calhoun. When Fox and Pitt died, there were no others to fill their place. Webster still lives, now that Calhoun and Clay are dead, the unrivaled statesman of his country Like Fox and Pitt, Clay and Calhoun lived in troubled times. Like Fox and Pitt, they were each of them the leader of rival parties. Like Fox and Pitt, they were idolized by their respective friends. Like Fox and Pitt, they died about the same time, and in the public service; and as has been said of Fox and Pitt, Clay and Calhoun died with 'their harness upon them. Like Fox and Pitt—

"'With more than mortal powers endowed,
How high they soared above the crowd;
Theirs was no common party race,
Jostling by dark intrigue for place—
Like fabled gods, their mighty war
Shook realms and nations in its jar.

Beneath each banner, proud to stand,
Looked up the noblest of the land.

* * * *

"'Here let their discord with them die,
Speak not for those a separate doom,
Whom fate made brothers in the tomb;
But search the land of living men,
Where wilt thou find their like again?'"

REMARKS OF MR. VENABLE.*

"Mr. Speaker: I trust that I shall be pardoned for adding a few words upon this sad occasion. The life of the illustrious statesman which has just terminated is so interwoven with our history, and the luster of his great name so profusely shed over its pages, that simple admiration of his high qualities might well be my excuse. But it is a sacred privilege to draw near—to contemplate the end of the great and good. It is profitable as well as purifying to look upon and realize the office of death in removing all that can excite jealousy or produce distrust, and to gaze upon the virtues which, like jewels, have survived his powers of destruction. The light which radiates from the life of a great and patriotic statesman, is often dimmed by the mists which party conflicts throw around it. But the blast which strikes him down purifies the atmosphere which surrounded him in life, and it shines forth in bright examples and well-earned renown. It is then that we witness the sincere acknowledgment of gratitude by a people who, having enjoyed the benefits arising from the services of an eminent statesman, embalm his name in their memory and hearts. We should cherish such recollections as well from patriotism as self-respect. Ours, sir, is now the duty in the midst of sadness, in this high place, in the face of our Republic, and before the world, to pay this tribute by acknowledging the merits of our colleague whose name has ornamented the Journals of Congress for near half a century. Few, very few, have ever combined the high intellectual powers and distinguished gifts of this illustrious senator. Cast in the finest mold by nature, he more than fulfilled the anticipations which were indulged by those who looked to a distinguished career as the certain result of that zealous pursuit of fame and usefulness upon which he entered in early life. Of the incidents of that life it is unnecessary for me to speak—they are as familiar as household words, and must be equally familiar to those who come after us. But it is useful to refresh memory by recurrence to some of the events which marked his career. We know, sir, that there is much that is in common in the histories of distinguished men. The elements which constitute greatness are the same in all times; hence those who have been the admiration of their generations present in their lives much which, although really great, ceases to be remarkable, because illustrated by such numerous examples—

* Abraham W. Venable, of North Carolina.

"'But there are deeds which should not pass away,
And names that must not wither.'

"Of such deeds the life of Henry Clay affords many and bright examples. His own name, and those with whom he associated, shall live with a freshness which time can not impair, and shine with a brightness which passing years can not dim. His advent into public life was as remarkable for the circumstances as it was brilliant in its effect. It was at a time in which genius and learning, statesmanship and eloquence, made the American Congress the most august body in the world. He was the cotemporary of a race of statesmen—some of whom then administering the Government, and others retiring and retired from office—presented an array of ability unsurpassed in our history. The elder Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Clinton, Gallatin, and Monroe, stood before the Republic in the maturity of their fame; while Calhoun, John Quincy Adams, Lowndes, Crawford, Gaston, Randolph, and Cheves, with a host of others, rose a bright galaxy upon our horizon. He who won his spurs in such a field, earned his knighthood. Distinction amid such competition was true renown—

"'The fame which a man wins for himself is best—
That he may call his own.'

* * * * * * * *

"It was with great satisfaction that I heard my friend from Kentucky [Mr. Breckinridge], the immediate representative of Mr. Clay, detail a conversation which disclosed the feelings of that eminent man in relation to his Christian hope. These, Mr. Speaker, are rich memorials, precious reminiscences. A Christian statesman is the glory of his age, and his memory will be glorious in after-times; it reflects a light coming from a source which clouds can not dim, nor shadows obscure. It was my privilege, also, a short time since, to converse with this distinguished statesman on the subject of his hopes in a future state. Feeling a deep interest, I asked him frankly what were his hopes in the world to which he was evidently hastening. 'I am pleased,' said he, 'my friend, that you have introduced the subject. Conscious that I must die very soon, I love to meditate upon the most important of all interests. I love to converse and to hear conversations about them. The vanity of the world, and its insufficieney to satisfy the soul of man, has been long a settled conviction of my mind. Man's inability to secure by his own merits the approbation of God, I feel to be true. I trust in the atonement of the Saviour of men, as the ground of my acceptance and my hope of salvation. My faith is feeble, but I hope in His mercy and trust in His promises.' To such declarations I listened with the deepest interest, as I did on another occasion, when he said: 'I am willing to abide the will of Heaven, and ready to die when that will shall determine it.'

"He is gone, sir, professing the humble hope of a Christian. That hope,

alone, sir, can sustain you, or any of us. There is one lonely and crushed heart that has bowed before this afflictive event. Far away, at Ashland, a widowed wife, prevented by feeble health from attending his bedside and soothing his painful hours, she has thought even the electric speed of the intelligence daily transmitted of his condition, too slow for her aching, anxious bosom. She will find consolation in his Christian submission, and will draw all of comfort that such a case admits from the assurance that nothing was neglected by the kindness of friends which could supply her place. May the guardianship of the widow's God be her protection, and His consolations her support!"

REMARKS OF MR. HAVEN.*

"Mr. Speaker: Representing a constituency distinguished for the constancy of its devotion to the political principles of Mr. Clay, and for its unwavering attachment to his fortunes and his person—sympathizing deeply with those whose more intimate personal relations with him have made them feel most profoundly this general bereavement—I desire to say a few words of him, since he has fallen among us, and been taken to his rest.

"After the finished eulogies which have been so eloquently pronounced by the honorable gentlemen who have preceded me, I will avoid a course of remark which might otherwise be deemed a repetition, and refer to the bearing of some of the acts of the deceased upon the interests and destinies of my own State. The influence of his public life, and of his *purely American character*, the benefits of his wise forecast, and the results of his efforts for wholesome and rational progress, are nowhere more strongly exhibited than in the State of New York.

"Our appreciation of his anxiety for the general diffusion of knowledge and education, is manifested in our twelve thousand public libraries, our equal number of common schools, and a large number of higher institutions of learning—all of which drew portions of their support from the share of the proceeds of the public lands, which his wise policy gave to our State. Our whole people are thus constantly reminded of their great obligations to the statesman whose death now afflicts the nation with sorrow. Our extensive public works attest our conviction of the utility and importance of the system of Internal Improvements he so ably advocated; and their value and productiveness afford a most striking evidence of the soundness and wisdom of his policy. Nor has his influence been less sensibly felt in our agriculture, commerce, and manufactures. Every department of human industry acknowledges his fostering care, and the people of New York are, in no small measure, indebted to his statesmanship for the wealth, comfort, contentment, and happiness so widely and generally diffused throughout the State.

"Well may New York cherish his memory and acknowledge with grati-

* Solomon G. Haven, of New York State.

tude the benefits that his life has conferred. That memory will be cherished throughout the Republic.

"When internal discord and sectional strife have threatened the integrity of the Union, his just weight of character, his large experience, his powers of conciliation and acknowledged patriotism, have enabled him to pacify the angry passions of his countrymen, and to raise the bow of promise and of hope upon the clouds which have darkened the political horizon.

"He has passed from among us, ripe in wisdom and pure in character—full of years and full of honors. He has breathed his last amid the blessings of a united and a grateful nation.

"He was, in my judgment, particularly fortunate in the time of his death.

"He lived to see his country, guided by his wisdom, come once again unhurt out of trying sectional difficulties and domestic strife; and he has closed his eyes in death upon that country while it is in the enjoyment of profound peace, busy with industry, and blessed with unequaled prosperity.

"It can fall to the lot of but few to die amid so warm a gratitude flowing from the hearts of their countrymen; and none can leave a brighter example or a more enduring fame."

REMARKS OF MR. BROOKS.*

"Mr. Speaker: I rise to add my humble tribute to the memory of a great and good man now to be gathered to his fathers. I speak for and from a community, in whose heart is enshrined the name of him whom we mourn; who, however much Virginia, the land of his birth, or Kentucky, the land of his adoption, may love him, is, if possible, loved where I live yet more. If idolatry had been Christian, or allowable even, he would have been our idol. But, as it is, for a quarter of a century now, his bust, his portrait, or some medal, has been one of our household gods, gracing not alone the saloon, and the halls of wealth, but the humblest room or workshop of almost every mechanic or laborer. Proud monuments of his policy as a statesman, as my colleague has justly said, are all about us, and we owe to him, in a good degree, our growth, our greatness, our prosperity and happiness, as a people.

"The great field of Henry Clay, Mr. Speaker, has been here, on the floor of this House, and in the other wing of the Capitol. He has held posts of higher nominal distinction, but they are all eclipsed by the brilliancy of his career as a Congressman. What of glory he has acquired, or what most endears him to his countrymen, have been won here, amid these pillars, under these domes of the Capitol.

"'*Si quæris monumentum, circumspice.*'

"The mind of Mr. Clay has been the governing mind of the country,

* James Brooks, of New York city.

more or less, ever since he has been on the stage of public action. In a minority, or a majority—more, perhaps, even in a minority than in the majority—he seems to have had some commission, Divine as it were, to persuade, to convince, to govern other men. His patriotism, his foresight, his grand conceptions, have created measures which the secret fascination of his manners, in-door, or his irresistible eloquence without, have enabled him almost always to frame into laws.

"Adverse administrations have yielded to him, or been borne down by him, or he has taken them captive as a leader, and carried the country and Congress with him. This power he has wielded now for nearly half a century, with nothing but reason and eloquence to back him. And yet, when he came here, years ago, he came from a then frontier State of this Union, heralded by no loud trumpet of fame, nay, quite unknown, unfortified even by any position, social or pecuniary; to quote his own words, his only 'heritage had been infancy, indigence, and ignorance.'

"In these days, Mr. Speaker, when mere civil qualifications for high public place—when long civil training and practical statesmanship—are held subordinate, a most discouraging prospect would be before our rising young men, were it not for some such names as Lowndes, Crawford, Clinton, Gaston, Calhoun, and Clay, scattered along the pages of our history, as stars or constellations, in a cloudless sky. They shine forth and show us that if the Chief Magistracy can not be won by such qualifications, a memory among men can be—a hold upon posterity as firm, as lustrous—nay, more imperishable. In the Capitolium of Rome there are long rows of marble slabs, on which are recorded the names of the Roman Consuls; but the eye wanders over this wilderness of letters but to light up and to kindle upon some Cato or Cicero. To win such fame, thus unsullied, as Mr. Clay has won, is worth any man's ambition. And how was it won? By courting the shifting gales of popularity? No, never! By truckling to the schemes, the arts and seductions of the demagogue? Never, never! His hardest battles as a public man—his greatest, most illustrious achievements—have been against, at first, an adverse public opinion. To gain an imperishable name, he has often braved the perishable popularity of the moment. That sort of courage which, in a public man, I deem the highest of all courage; that sort of courage most necessary under our form of government to guide as well as to save a State, Mr. Clay was possessed of—more than any public man I ever knew. Mere physical courage, valuable, indispensable though it be, we share but with the brute—but moral courage, to dare to do right, amid all temptations to do wrong, is, as it seems to me, the very highest species, the noblest heroism, under institutions like ours. 'I had rather be right than be President,' was Mr. Clay's sublime reply when pressed to refrain from some measure that would mar his popularity. These lofty words were a clew to his whole character—the secret of his hold upon the heads as well as hearts of the American people—nay, the key to his immortality.

"Another of the keys, Mr. Speaker, of his universal reputation, was his intense nationality. When taunted but recently, almost within our hearing, as it were, on the floor of the Senate, by a Southern senator, as being a Southern man unfaithful to the South, his indignant but patriotic exclamation was; 'I know no *South*—no North, no East, no West.' The country, the *whole* country, loved, adored, reverenced such a man. The soil of Virginia may be his birthplace: the sod of Kentucky will cover his grave —what was mortal they claim—but the spirit, the soul, the genius of the mighty man, the immortal part, these belong to his country and to his God."

REMARKS OF MR. FAULKNER.*

"After the many able and eloquent addresses to which we have listened this morning, I fear, sir, that it will not be in my power to add any thing to the interest of this occasion. And yet, representing, as I do, in part, that State which gave birth to the distinguished man whose death has this day been announced on this floor, and having for many years held toward him the most cordial relations of friendship, personal and political, I feel that I should fail to discharge an appropriate duty, if I permitted this occasion to pass by without some expression of the feeling which such an event is so well calculated to elicit. It is true, sir, that this intelligence does not fall upon our ears unexpectedly; for months the public mind has been prepared for the great national loss which we now deplore; and yet, as familiar as the daily and hourly reports have made us with his hopeless condition and gradual decline, and although

> "'Like a shadow thrown
> Softly and sweetly from a passing cloud,
> Death fell upon him,'

it is impossible that a light of such surpassing splendor should be, as it is now, forever extinguished from our view, without producing a shock, deeply and painfully felt to the utmost limits of this great Republic. Sir, we all feel that a mighty intellect has passed from among us; but, happily for this country, happily for mankind, not until it had accomplished to some extent the exalted mission for which it had been sent upon this earth—not until it had reached the full maturity of its usefulness and power—not until it had shed a bright and radiant luster over our national renown—not until time had enabled it to bequeath the rich treasures of its thought and experience for the guidance and instruction of the present and of succeeding generations.

"Sir, it is difficult—it is impossible—within the limits allowed for remarks upon occasions of this kind, to do justice to a great historical character like Henry Clay. He was one of that class of men whom Scaliger designates as *homines centarii*—men that appear upon the earth but once in a century. His fame is the growth of years, and it would require time

* Charles James Faulkner, of Virginia.

to unfold the elements which have combined to impart to it so much of stability and grandeur. Volumes have already been written, and volumes will continue to be written, to record those eminent and distinguished public services which have placed him in the front rank of American statesmen and patriots. The highest talent, fired by a fervid and patriotic enthusiasm, has exhausted, and will continue to exhaust its powers, to portray those striking and generous incidents of his life, those shining and captivating qualities of his heart, which have made him one of the most beloved, as he was one of the most admired of men; and yet the subject itself will remain as fresh and exhaustless as if hundreds of the best intellects of the land had not quaffed the inspiration of their genius from the ever-gushing and overflowing fountains of his fame. It is impossible that a reputation so grand and colossal as that which attaches to the name of Henry Clay, could rest for its base upon any single virtue, however striking, or upon any single act, no matter how marked or distinguished. Such a reputation as he has left behind him, could only be the result of a long life of illustrious public service. And such it truly was. For nearly half a century he has been a prominent actor in all the stirring and eventful scenes of American history; fashioning and molding many of the most important measures of public policy by his bold and sagacious mind, and arresting others by his unconquerable energy and resistless force of eloquence. And, however much the members of this body may differ in opinion as to the wisdom of many of his views of national domestic policy, there is not one upon this floor—no, sir, not one in this nation—who will deny to him frankness and directness as a public man—a genius for statesmanship of the highest order—extraordinary capacities for public usefulness, and an ardent and elevated patriotism, without stain and without reproach. * * *

"One of the most distinguished characteristics of Mr. Clay as a public man, was his loyalty to truth and to the honest convictions of his own mind. He deceived no man—he would not permit his own heart to be deceived by any of those seductive influences which too often warp the judgment of men in public life. He never paused to consider how far any step which he was about to take would lead to his own personal advancement; he never calculated what he might lose or what he might gain by his advocacy of, or his opposition to, any particular measure. His single inquiry was, 'Is it right? Is it in accordance with the Constitution of the land? Will it redound to the permanent welfare and interest of the country?' When satisfied upon these points, his determination was fixed—his purpose was immovable. * * * And yet, sir, with all of that personal and moral intrepidity which so eminently marked the character of Mr. Clay—with his well-known inflexibility of purpose, and unyielding determination—such was the genuine sincerity of his patriotism, and such his thorough comprehension of those principles of compromise, upon which the whole structure of our Government was founded, that no one

was more prompt to relax the rigor of his policy the moment he perceived that it was calculated to disturb the harmony of the States, or endanger, in any degree, the stability of the Government. With him, the love of this Union was a passion—an absorbing sentiment which gave color to every act of his public life. It triumphed over party; it triumphed over policy; it subdued the natural fierceness and haughtiness of his temper, and brought him into the most kindly and cordial relations with all those who, upon all other questions, were deeply and bitterly opposed to him. It has been asserted, sir, upon high medical authority, and doubtless with truth, that his life was, in all probability, shortened ten years by the arduous and extraordinary labors which he assumed at the memorable session of 1850. If so, he has added the crowning glory of the Martyr to the spotless fame of the Patriot; and we may well hope that a great national pacification, purchased at such a sacrifice, will long continue to cement the bonds of this great and glorious Union. * * *"

REMARKS OF MR. PARKER.*

"Mr. Speaker: This is a solemn—a consecrated hour. And I would not detain the members of the House from indulging in the silent eloquence of their own feelings, so grateful to hearts chastened as ours.

"But I can not restrain an expression from a bosom pained with its fullness.

"When my young thoughts first took cognizance of the fact that I have a country, my eye was attracted by the magnificent proportions of Henry Clay.

"The idea absorbed me then, that he was, above all other men, the embodiment of my country's genius.

"I have watched him; I have studied him; I have admired him; and—God forgive me! for he was but a man, 'of like passions with us'—I fear I have *idolized* him, until this hour.

"But he has gone from among men; and it is for us now to awake and apply ourselves, with renewed fervor and increased fidelity, to the welfare of the country HE loved so well and served so truly and so long—the glorious country yet saved to us! * * *"

REMARKS OF MR. GENTRY.†

"Mr. Speaker: I do not rise to pronounce a eulogy on the life, and character, and public services of the illustrious orator and statesman whose death this nation deplores. Suitably to perform that task, a higher eloquence than I possess might essay in vain. The gushing tears of the nation, the deep grief which oppresses the hearts of more than twenty millions of people, constitute a more eloquent eulogium upon the life, and character,

* Samuel W. Parker, of Indiana.

† Meredith P. Gentry, of Tennessee.

and patriotic services of Henry Clay, than the power of language can express. In no part of our country is that character more admired, or those public services more appreciated, than in the State which I have the honor, in part, to represent. I claim for the people of that State a full participation in the general woe which the sad announcement of to-day will everywhere inspire."

REMARKS OF MR. BOWIE.*

"I rise not to utter the measured phrases of premeditated woe, but to speak as would my constituents speak, if they stood around the grave now opened to receive the mortal remains, not of a statesman only, but of a beloved friend. If there is a State in this Union, other than Kentucky, which sends up a wail of more bitter and sincere sorrow than another, that State is Maryland. In her midst this departed statesman was a frequent and a welcome guest. At many a board, and many a fireside, his noble form was the light of the eyes and the idol of the heart. Throughout her borders, in cottage, hamlet, and cities, his name is a household word—his thoughts are familiar sentences. Though not permitted to be first at his cradle, Maryland would be last at his tomb. Through all the phases of political fortune, amid all the storms which darkened his career, Maryland cherished him in her inmost heart, as the most gifted, patriotic, and eloquent of men; and for him daily, to this hour, prayers ascended, night and morning, for his temporal and eternal welfare. Maryland would, in the language of inspiration, exclaim, 'This day hath a prince and a ruler fallen in Israel!' Daughters of America, weep for him who hath 'clothed you in scarlet and fine linen!'

"The husbandman at his plow, the artisan at the anvil, the seaman on the mast, will pause and drop a tear when he hears that Clay is no more.

"The advocate for freedom in both hemispheres, he will be lamented alike on the shores of the Hellespont and the banks of the Mississippi and Orinoco. The freed men of Liberia, learning and practicing the art of self-government, and civilizing Africa, have lost a patron and protector, a father and friend. America mourns the departure of a luminary, which enlightened and illustrated the continent; the United States, a counselor of deepest wisdom and purest purpose; mankind, the advocate of human rights and constitutional liberty."

REMARKS OF MR WALSH.†

"Mr. Speaker: The illustrious man whose death we this day mourn was so long my political leader—so long almost the object of my personal idolatry—that I can not allow that he shall go down to the grave without a word at least of affectionate remembrance—without a tribute to a memory

* Richard J. Bowie, of Maryland.

† Thomas Yates Walsh, of Maryland.

which will exact tributes as long as a heart shall be found to beat within the bosom of civilized man, and human agency shall be adequate in any *form* to give them an expression. And even, sir, if I had no heartfelt sigh to pour out here—if I had no tear for that coffin's lid—I should do injustice to those whose representative in part I am, if I did not, in this *presence*, and at this time, raise my voice to swell the accents of the profoundest public sorrow. * * *

"We can all remember, sir, when adverse political results disheartened his friends, and made them feel even as men without hope, his own clarion voice was still heard in the assertion and the pursuit of rights, as bold and as eloquent as when it first proclaimed the freedom of the seas, and its talismanic tones struck off the badges of bondage from the lands of the Incas and the plains of Marathon.

"Mr. Speaker, in the exaltation of the statesman, he did not forget the duties of the man. He was an affectionate adviser on all points wherein inexperienced youth might require counsel. He was a disinterested sympathizer in personal sorrows that called for consolation. He was ever upright and honorable in all the duties incident to his relations in life.

"To an existence so lovely, Heaven in its mercy granted a fitting and appropriate close. It was the prayer, Mr. Speaker, of a distinguished citizen, who died some years since in this metropolis, even while his spirit was fluttering for its final flight, that he might depart gracefully. It may not be presumptuous to say, that what was in that instance the aspiration of a chivalric *gentleman*, was in this the realization of the dying Christian, in which was blended all that human dignity could require, with all that divine grace had conferred—in which the firmness of the man was only transcended by the fervor of the penitent.

"A short period before his death, he remarked to one by his bedside that he was fearful he was becoming selfish, as his thoughts were entirely withdrawn from the world, and centered upon eternity. This, sir, was but the purification of his noble spirit from all the dross of earth—a happy illustration of what the religious muse has so sweetly sung:

> "'No sin to stain—no lure to stay
> The soul, as home she springs;
> Thy sunshine on her joyful way,
> Thy freedom on her wings.'

"Mr. Speaker, the solemnities of this hour may soon be forgotten. We may come back from the new-made grave only still to show that we consider 'eternity the bubble, life and time the enduring substance.' We may not pause long enough by the brink to ask which of us revelers of the day shall next be at rest. But be assured, sir, that upon the records of mortality will never be inscribed a name more illustrious than that of the statesman, patriot, and friend, whom the nation mourns."

THE SPEAKER.*

"The Chair asks leave to give notice to the House, that members of the Senate and House will form a procession at the National Hotel to-morrow, at twenty minutes past eleven, to accompany the remains of Mr. Clay to the Capitol for funeral ceremonies. The remains will pass thence to the cars, and depart for Kentucky."

The question was then put, on the adoption of the resolutions proposed by Mr. Breckinridge, and they were unanimously adopted,

And the House adjourned.

* Linn Boyd, of Kentucky.

NOTE F—Page 262.

The funeral cortège appointed by the Senate of the United States, to accompany the remains of Mr. Clay from Washington to Lexington, rested for the night at Baltimore, where the profoundest sorrow reigned, and every befitting honor was rendered to the memory of the illustrious deceased, by the civic authorities, by the military, and by all ranks of people. The next morning the cortège, with their charge, took the cars for Philadelphia, accompanied to the railroad dépôt by a civic and military procession. Crowds of sorrowing people, of all ages, and both sexes, flocked to the villages and towns on the road, to express their sympathy and grief. At Wilmington, Delaware, the concourse was great; and they were gratified by being permitted to approach and see the coffin of the statesman who had been so much loved and honored in the State of Delaware. The sun was down, and the shades of night came over the city of Philadelphia, before the cortège arrived. But the preparations for the reception were on the largest scale, and the procession to the old State House, where, in the Hall of Independence, the corpse was deposited for the night, under a guard of honor, was of the most imposing and solemn character. It is needless to say, that the great heart of Philadelphia was moved with sorrow as never before. Ever honored there while living, he was wept there by tens of thousands as he was borne through their midst in his coffin. After affording an opportunity, as far as possible, for the citizens, early in the morning of Saturday, to walk around the remains of one so much beloved, a committee from Philadelphia took charge of the body, and, being escorted to the river by a military and civic procession, moved forward by steamboat and railway, to meet a committee from New York, who received the sacred trust, and took it in charge, till, in the evening, it was deposited in the Governor's room at the City Hall, there to rest

over the Sabbath, under a guard of honor. Even the city of New York was hushed to solemn silence on this mournful occasion; and it was computed that a hundred thousand persons visited the Governor's room on Saturday evening and Sunday, without the slightest disorder, and all in solemn silence. We need not say, that the public demonstrations were all suited to the occasion; but the public funeral at New York was not solemnized till the 20th of July, which was the greatest and most solemn pageant of the kind ever witnessed in that city.

Early on Monday morning the remains of Mr. Clay were removed from the City Hall to the steamboat for Albany, which were saluted on the passage by half-mast flags, and by other symbols, from every craft on the river, and by booming guns from every village and town on the Hudson, between New York and Albany. The city of Albany had the honor of receiving and guarding the remains of the great statesman for the night, and she discharged the duty in a manner worthy of herself. Early in the morning the cortège moved on for Buffalo, stopping at the principal towns and villages to gratify the assembled multitudes, and to permit them to manifest their part of the deep and universal sorrow. They were received in Buffalo by torchlight, and there, too, was enacted another sad and funereal pageant suited to the occasion. So at Cleveland, so at Columbus, so at Cincinnati, and so on the whole line of travel, till the cortège arrived at Louisville, and landed the remains of Henry Clay on the soil of Kentucky, his adopted State, which had ever delighted to honor him, and which, as he himself once said, had "carried him aloft in her noble arms, as well when fortune frowned as when she smiled." Though the grief of the nation was sincere, that of Kentucky was the sorrow of a parent for the loss of a son. She was entitled to the first place in the long procession; and we are not surprised to see her tears flow more copiously, and her symbols of mourning more expressive. So was it at Louisville, so was it at Frankfort, the capital of the State, and so was it on the whole line of the railway to Lexington, where the cortège arrived, as stated in the text, at sunset, on Friday, the 9th of July.

As far as the sight could reach, there was one sea of heads. The mission of the Senate Committee was ended, and Mr. Underwood addressed the Chairman of the Committee of Lexington, as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Lexington Committee: Mr. Clay desired to be buried in the cemetery of your city. I made known his wish to the Senate after he was dead. That body, in consideration of the respect entertained for him, and his long and eminent public services, appointed a committee of six senators to attend his remains to this place. My relations to Mr. Clay, as his colleague, and as the mover of the resolution, induced the President of the Senate to appoint me the chairman of the committee. The other gentlemen comprising the committee are distinguished, all of them, for eminent civil services, each having been the executive head of a State or Territory, and some of them no less distinguished for brilliant military achievements. I can not permit this occasion to pass without an expression of my gratitude to each member of the Senate's Committee. They have, to testify their personal respect and appreciation of the character, private and public, of Mr. Clay, left their seats in the Senate, for a time, and honored his remains by conducting them to their last resting-place. I am sure that you, gentlemen of the Lexington Committee, and the people of Kentucky, will ever bear my associates in grateful remembrance.

"Our journey, since we left Washington, has been a continued procession. Everywhere the people have pressed forward to manifest their feelings toward the illustrious dead. Delegations from cities, towns, and villages, have waited on us. The pure and the lovely, the mothers and daughters of the land, as we passed, covered the coffin with garlands of flowers, and bedewed it with tears. It has been no triumphal procession in honor of a living man, stimulated by hopes of reward. It has been the voluntary tribute of a free and grateful people to the glorious dead. We have brought with us, to witness the last sad ceremony, a delegation from the Clay Association of the city of New York, and delegations from the cities of Cincinnati and Dayton, in Ohio. Much as we have seen on our way, it is small compared with the great movement of popular sympathy and admiration which everywhere burst forth in honor of the departed statesman. The rivulets we have witnessed are concentrating; and in their union will form the ocean tide that shall lave the base of the pyramid of Mr. Clay's fame forever.

"Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Lexington Committee, I have but one remaining duty to perform, and that is, to deliver to you, the neighbors and friends of Mr. Clay, when living, his dead body for interment. From my acquaintance with your characters, and especially with your chairman, who was my schoolmate in boyhood, my associate in the legislature in early manhood, and afterward a co-laborer, for many years, on the bench of the Appellate Court, I know that you will do all that duty and propriety require, in burying him, whose last great services to his country were performed from Christian motives, without hopes of office or earthly reward."

As he closed, the chairman of the Lexington Committee,

Chief Justice Robertson, sharing the emotions of all present, and himself deeply affected, replied:

"Senator Underwood, Chairman, and Associate Senators of the Committee of Conveyance: Here, your long and mournful cortège, at last ends—your melancholy mission is now fulfilled—and, this solemn moment, you dissolve forever your official connection with your late distinguished colleague of Kentucky.

"With mingled emotions of sorrow and gratitude, we receive from your hands, into the arms of his devoted State and the bosom of his beloved city, all that now remains on earth of Henry Clay. Having attained, with signal honor, the patriarchal age of seventy-six, and hallowed his setting sun by the crowning act of his eventful drama, a wise and benevolent Providence has seen fit to close his pilgrimage, and to allow him to act—as we trust he was prepared to act—a still nobler and better part in a purer world, where life is deathless. This was, doubtless, best for him, and, in the inscrutable dispensations of a benignant Almighty, best for his country. Still, it is but natural that his countrymen, and his neighbors especially, should feel and exhibit sorrow at the loss of a citizen so useful, so eminent, and so loved. And not as his associates only, but as Kentuckians and Americans, we, of Lexington and Fayette, feel grateful for the unexampled manifestations of respect for his memory, to which you have so eloquently alluded, as having everywhere graced the more than triumphal procession of his dead body homeward from the national capital, where, in the public service, he fell with his armor on and untarnished. We feel, Mr. Chairman, especially grateful to yourself and your colleagues here present, for the honor of your kind accompaniment of your precious deposit to his last home. Equally divided in your party names, equally the personal friends of the deceased, equally sympathizing with a whole nation in the Providential bereavement, and all distinguished for your public services and the confidence of constituents—you were peculiarly suited to the sacred trust of escorting his remains to the spot chosen by himself for their repose. Having performed that solemn service in a manner creditable to yourselves and honorable to his memory, Kentucky thanks you for your patriotic magnanimity. And allow me, as her organ on this valedictory occasion, to express for her, as well as for myself and committee, the hope that your last days may be far distant, and that, come when they may, as they certainly must come, sooner or later, to all of you, the death of each of you may deserve to be honored by the grateful outpourings of national respect which signalize the death of our universally lamented Clay.

"Unlike Burke, he never 'gave up to party what was meant for mankind.' His intrepid nationality, his lofty patriotism, and his comprehensive philanthropy, illustrated by his country's annals for half a century, magnified him among statesmen, and endeared him to all classes, and ages, and

sexes of his countrymen. And, therefore, his name, like Washington's, will belong to no party, or section, or time.

"Your kind allusion, Mr. Chairman, to reminiscences of our personal associations is cordially reciprocated—the longer we have known, the more we have respected each other. Be assured that the duty you have devolved on our committee shall be faithfully performed. The body you commit to us shall be properly interred in a spot of its mother earth, which, as 'THE GRAVE OF CLAY,' will be more and more consecrated by time to the affections of mankind.

"How different, however, would have been the feelings of us all, if, instead of the pulseless, speechless, breathless Clay, now in cold and solemn silence before us, you had brought with you to his family and neighbors, the *living man*, in all the majesty of his transcendent moral power, as we once knew, and often saw and heard him. But with becoming resignation, we bow to a dispensation which was doubtless as wise and beneficent as it was melancholy and inevitable.

"To the accompanying committees from New York, Dayton, and Cincinnati, we tender our profound acknowledgments for their voluntary sacrifice of time and comfort to honor the obsequies of our illustrious countryman.

"In the sacred and august presence of the illustrious dead, were an eulogistic speech befitting the occasion, it could not be made by me. *I* could not thus speak over the dead body of Henry Clay. Kentucky expects not me, nor any other of her sons, to speak his eulogy now, if ever. She would leave that grateful task to other States and to other times. His name needs not our panegyric. The carver of his own fortune, the founder of his own name; with his own hands he has built his own monument, and with his own tongue and his own pen he has stereotyped his autobiography. With hopeful trust his maternal commonwealth consigns his fame to the justice of history and to the judgment of ages to come. His ashes he bequeathed to her, and they will rest in her bosom until the judgment day; his fame will descend, as the common heritage of his country, to every citizen of that Union, of which he was thrice the triumphant champion, and whose genius and value are so beautifully illustrated by his model life.

"But, though we feel assured that his renown will survive the ruins of the Capitol he so long and so admirably graced, yet Kentucky will rear to his memory a magnificent mausoleum—a votive monument—to mark the spot where his relics shall sleep, and to testify to succeeding generations, that our Republic, however unjust it may too often be to *living* merit, will ever cherish a grateful remembrance of the *dead* patriot, who dedicated his life to his country, and with rare ability, heroic firmness, and self-sacrificing constancy, devoted his talents and his time to the cause of PATRIOTISM, of LIBERTY, and of TRUTH."

The following somewhat glowing account of what occurred,

from the arrival of the cortège at Lexington to the commencement of the funeral discourse, we borrow from the hand of an eye-witness:

At the close of this address, the procession was formed, headed by a cavalcade of horsemen, preceding the hearse, which was followed by the Senate Committee, and the deputation from New York, in carriages, as mourners; the Clay Guard, of Cincinnati; the deputation of fourteen, from Dayton, Ohio; the seventy-six, from Louisville, and the citizens in the rear—their march being under the funeral arches, and through the somber street—lined by the silent multitude—toward that place known to every inhabitant of the Republic, and throughout the civilized world, as the home of the great commoner.

Who can fittingly speak of the agonized group awaiting, at Ashland, the arrival of the remains of him who had been husband, father, and the beloved master? That wife, who, for fifty-three years and upward, had been his faithful partner—sharer of his triumphs and of his many trials; whose saint-like virtues had secured to her the affection and veneration of all classes in the place where she was so well known; herself more than threescore years a sojourner on earth, having survived her parents and all her daughters, with gallant sons moldering in the tomb, bending beneath the weight of this, her speechless sorrow; bowing with years, and broken in health, amid surviving children, grandchildren, and kindred; and gathering around them, the old and young of their servants, awaited there the remains of her husband.

Guided by the many torches, the train moved through the grounds designed and laid out under his supervision. It was in truth a solemn—a holy scene. Under the dark shadows of the spreading grove, treading on a lawn where the wild flower, the myrtle, and the laurel were strangely mingled, they bore him toward that portal which had last seen him depart near the close of the preceding year, impelled again to cross the mountains, and to tread the Halls of Congress, because there had come to him a rumor of a threatened resumption of sectional controversies. * * *

They gently laid him beneath his own roof, and in that room where he had, for half a century, received the homage of countless thousands, representing all classes and callings—the gifted and the great of either sex—coming from every country, and traveling from all directions, to Lexington, that they might thus, in person, pay tribute to the worth, the genius, the patriotism, and surpassing excellence of the private and public character of the illustrious host.

Beside the bier were gathered his sons, some of his grandsons, and nephews; behind these the family servants. * * *

The Clay Guard, of Cincinnati, solicited the honor of watching over his remains—this, the last night before sepulture. * * *

In the deep hours of the night—alone with him and her God—the

widow knelt beside her husband's corpse. For that hour it was directed that she should not be disturbed. In that hour what other heart knew her thronging memories of joys and sorrows, save the spirit of the dead she longed to join. * * * They had commenced together the struggles of life. Together they had planned their home—together they had arranged their grounds, and with their own hands had planted the young shoots of what now were the stately trees of Ashland. * * * Life had opened to them full of the bright hope and promise that belong to youth, energy, and commanding abilities. She had seen him leap into a dazzling greatness, reflecting honor and dignity upon his native land, lifting his young State to the front rank of her compeers, and conferring prosperity upon his country and her citizens, while he gave stability and permanence to the institutions and laws of the land, and cemented together the Union, as he ardently desired, prayed for, and labored ceaselessly to accomplish, from end to end—from center to circumference. * * * There were born to them, in this happy home, eleven children—six daughters and five sons. Where are they now? No daughter survived, on whose breast that aged head could rest. Four sons only remained, and one a lunatic. * * *

In that dread hour, through her thronging mind, passed the remembrance of a life-time. She had the sympathy and regard of millions, and in that watch of the dead, she was accompanied by the thoughts of countless thousands, who remembered what event the morrow was to commemorate in history. * * *

Long before the day had fairly broke (Saturday, July 10), every avenue of approach to the city was crowded by those who came to Lexington to render their last tribute to him who had always, living, received their measureless devotion. * * * It was computed that nearly one hundred thousand persons, of all classes and both sexes, had come together on that memorable occasion. * * *

At an early hour, those appointed to meet at Ashland, had gathered together within the house: The pall-bearers, his oldest and most distinguished friends in Kentucky, the Senate Committee, and the deputation from New York, with his family and kindred. In front were arranged the deputations from other States, from the Masonic fraternity, and a dense crowd were in a semicircular array before the porch. Upon a bier, cushioned with flowers, and immediately in front of the door, they laid the iron coffin that inclosed the body of HENRY CLAY. Upon it shone a clear, cloudless sun. Upon the breast of it reposed the civic wreaths, while strewed around were the floral offerings of every principal place, from the national capital to the grave. * * *

From Washington to the tomb was one votive offering of wreaths of oak, immortelles, the cypress, the ivy, and the laurel—bouquets of flowers of every species, and in wondrous profusion. It was no unfrequent sight to witness youth and beauty bend and press their lips upon his sable shroud. Old men would pause beside his iron case, and burst into uncon-

trollable sobs. Early manhood and middle age, that had banked their hopes in him, and clung to him as their chieftain and their leader, to the last moment resisting the assured certainty that they were no more to listen to that silver voice, nor hang upon its tones, with speechless woe at length realized, that for the future, his memory and the preservation of his patriotic principles were their future charge.

His late colleagues in the Senate—that revered band of chosen intimates, who were honored as his pall-bearers, the New York delegation, and his family and kindred, grouped near the porch and within his dwelling; on the porch stood the minister of GOD, at whose hand he had received the sacrament, when last he was alive, within those halls—the same minister who had baptized him, his children that were left to him, and the children of his dead son, Colonel Clay—while all around the eye rested on his near friends and neighbors, who were there assembled, and yet without these, lines of people from many States, and the far-off counties of his own.

The funeral services were performed by the Rev. Edward F. Berkley, Rector of Christ Church, Lexington, who delivered the following address before the procession moved from Ashland:

"MY FRIENDS: A nation's griefs are bursting forth at the fall of one of her noblest sons.

"A mighty man in wisdom—in intellect—in truth—lies in our presence to-day, insensible, inanimate and cold. The heart which once beat with a pure and lofty patriotism—shall beat no more. The renowned statesman, who was learned in the laws of diplomacy and government, will never again give his counsel in affairs of state. And the voice which was ever raised in behalf of truth and liberty, is silenced forever!

"Indulge me in a remark or two, while I speak of him; and in consideration of the personal comfort of this immense assembly, my words shall be few.

"This is neither a proper place nor a fit occasion to dwell on the peculiar and striking incidents of his public life; and I mean to say a few words only of his character as viewed in connection with religion.

"We have not come here to weave a garland of praises for the brow of the fallen statesman, nor to throw the incense of adulation upon the urn which incloses his ashes; but we have come here to pay the last offices of respect and affection, to a neighbor and a friend; and to draw, from the visitation which has stricken down one of the mightiest of our mighty men, such lessons as are calculated to teach us 'what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue.'

"Our venerated friend has been before the public eye for half a century; and for nearly the whole of that period in the occupancy of high public places. He has done the State great service. He combined in his character such elements as could make him no other man than he was, except, that he might have been as great a soldier as he was a statesman and

orator. But the crowning excellence of all his virtues, was this—he was a Christian.

"As he was eminently open, candid, and honest, in his long public career, so was he deeply sincere in his adoption, as the rule of his life, of the principles of our holy religion.

"Although the suns of seventy summers had shone down upon him before he made a public profession of Christ, yet, when he did make it, he did it, not mechanically, and as a matter of course, because he was an old man—he did it heartily, and upon conviction, because he felt himself to be a sinner, and because he felt the need of a Saviour! And when he came to make the inquiry, What shall I do? and it was told him what he ought to do—he did it gladly—he made haste to fulfill the purposes of his heart. And his great mind being brought to the investigation of the pure and simple doctrines of the Cross, new beauties, in a new world broke in upon him, of the existence of which, to their full extent, he had never dreamed before. And I know, that in times when he lay under the hand of disease, and of great bodily infirmity, here at home, he clung to those doctrines, by a lively faith, as the highest consolation of his soul.

"Although he had his Church preferences, yet the power and influence of the teachings of Christianity, rightly understood, gave rise to sympathies in his nature, which extended to all Christian people.

"Surrounded as he was, by the allurements and fascination of a high public place, nevertheless, he strove to walk in the pure and perfect way; and by a steady maintenance of the principles which bound him to religion and to God—like the eagle, with his eye fixed upon the sun, his course was onward and upward!

"And these principles, which our illustrious friend found so comforting and consoling in life, did not forsake him when he had nothing else on earth to cling to.

"In reference to some of his last hours, a lady, connected with him by family, who recently spent several days at his bedside, writes: 'He is longing to be gone, and said something of this kind to me, which caused me to ask him if he did not feel perfectly willing to wait until the Almighty called him. He replied, O, my dear child, do not misunderstand me—I supplicate Him continually for patience to do so. I am ready to go—no, not *ready*, but *willing*. We are none of us *ready*. We can not trust in our own merits, but must look to him *entirely*.'

"The writer adds: 'He is the most gentle, patient, and affectionate sick person I almost ever saw—thanks you for every thing, and is as little trouble as he can possibly be.'

"And this is the power of religion upon a vigorous and discriminating mind—a mind fully capable of meeting all the great emergencies which have ever arisen in its collisions with other great minds, at the bar, in the Senate, and in the forum.

"And O, the recollection to mourning friends, and to a mourning country,

is of the most consoling interest, that, as in his life, by his genius and wisdom, he threw light, and peace, and blessing upon his country, so, in his death, the Glorious Giver of grace and wisdom threw light, and peace, and blessing upon him—borne upward, as he was, by the aspirations to heaven, of a million hearts.

"But his earthly career is run. Full of age and full of honors, he goes down to earth, to ashes, and to dust. A man of extraordinary genius; a man of the highest practical wisdom—possessing the largest powers of true eloquence—a pure patriot, a sincere Christian, and a friend of his race.

"His friends will grieve for him—the Church has lost him—his country will bewail him—and hereafter, when the passing traveler shall come to Ashland, and look for the bland, agreeable, and hospitable host, *he will not find him here!* His aged wife, who, for more than fifty years, has grieved with him in his sorrows, and rejoiced with him in his public success, shall go down unto the grave, mourning; and men in every civilized nation of the earth will shed a tear at the fall of such a man. But he is gone to a brighter and a better world; while this memorial shall remain of him here, that he was as simple and sincere in his religion, as he was great in wisdom and mighty in intellect.

"God is no respecter of persons. Neither genius, nor wisdom, nor power, nor greatness can avert the fatal darts which fly thick and fast around us. If public services of the highest value, a fair fame which reaches to the utmost habitations of civilized man, and an integrity as stern as steel, could have done this, a nation had not been in tears to-day.

"But the great and the humble—the useful and the useless—the learned and the ignorant—the mighty and the mean—the public and the private man—must all, alike, lie down in the cold chambers of the grave! Death is the common leveler of men and of nations. Temples and monuments, which have been erected to perpetuate the achievements of statesmen and of heroes in past ages, have been ruined and robbed of their grandeur by the insatiable tooth of time—not a vestige remains of the glory that once covered the earth, and not a stone to mark the spot where the master of the world was laid.

"And this is the end of man! This the obscurity and oblivion to which he shall come at last! But his end may be worse than this, if he has no hope in the blessed SAVIOUR'S death. For, whoever confides in the world for the bestowment of true happiness—whoever trusts to its gains, its pleasures, or its honors, to bring him peace at the last—will find himself miserably imposed upon, and grievously deluded. He will find that this misplaced confidence will involve him in ruin, as inevitable as it will be eternal!

> "'Lean not on earth! 'twill pierce thee to the heart;—
> A broken reed at best, but oft a spear!
> On its sharp point, peace bleeds and hope expires.'

"If we aspire to a true, a deathless, immortality, let us not seek it in the

praises of men, or in the enrollment of our name upon the page of history; for these all shall perish! But let us seek, by obedience to God, and a recognition of the claims of religion, to have our names written in the Lamb's Book of Life. This, and this only, will guaranty an immortality as imperishable as the heavens, and as certain as the Life of God.

"The observation is almost universal, that 'all men think all men mortal but themselves.' And yet there is nothing more surely reserved for us in the future than disease and dissolution. And these, too, may, and very often do, come when we are least expecting a disturbance of our plans.

"The statesman falls with plans of future glory yet unaccomplished; the poet expires in the midst of his song, and the magic of his muse lingers on his dying lips; the sculptor drops his chisel before he has taught the marble to breathe—and the painter his pencil, while the living figures on his canvas are yet unfinished; the sword slips from the hand of the warrior before the battle is won; and the orator is silenced while the words of wisdom are yet dropping in sweetest accents from his lips.

"'I said, Ye are gods, and children of the Most High, but ye shall die like men.'

"No consideration can purchase a moment's respite, when the decree shall go forth, 'This night thy soul shall be required of thee!' whether it be uttered at the doors of the stately mansion, or at the cot of the lowly poor. And not to be wisely and well prepared to hear this summons is destructive of the best interests of the soul. Happy they who have made a friend in God. Happy they who have done, and they who do, this in early life—the failing of which, in his case, our revered friend so often himself regretted—thrice happy they in whom greatness and goodness meet together. Imperishable joys shall be awarded to them. They shall shine as stars in the firmament forever and ever. In each successive generation their 'memory shall be blessed,' and their 'name be had in everlasting remembrance;' and, 'their conflicts o'er, their labors done,' the ransomed spirit shall escape from the prison that confines it to the earth, and the King of kings shall bind upon their victorious brow wreaths of unfading glory, in that blessed place,

> "'Where pain, and weariness, and sorrow cease,
> And cloudless sunshine fills the land of peace.'

"Our great friend and countryman is dead! He has no more connection with the living world, and we are about to bear his honored remains to the beautiful spot where our own dead lie, and around which our memories love to linger. What to him, I ask you, are now the policy or the politics of the country? What to him, now, are the nice points upon which turns the honor of the State? What to him, now, is the extension of empire?—the rise or fall of nations?—the dethronement or the establishment of kings? His work is done, and well done. As it is with him, so shall it shortly be with every one of us. Then,

"'So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan that moves
To the pale realms of shade where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death—
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon; but sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.'

"One word more. The distinguished subject of our present attention has fallen a martyr to his country. The cause of his sickness and his death originated in his last great efforts in securing the passage, through Congress, of certain measures, known as THE COMPROMISE. In more seness than one may he receive the heavenly welcome, 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' His love of country—his enthusiasm in any cause in which her interests were involved—his great and singular powers—his wonderful and controlling influence over even great minds, marked him as *the* man of the age, and adapted him, in a peculiar manner, to act and to lead in grave matters of government.

"And if, in the future, any one section of this great Republic should be arrayed in hostility against another; and any cruel hand shall be uplifted to sever the bonds which unite us together as a common people—the Genius of Liberty shall come down in anguish and in tears, and throwing herself prostrate before his tomb, implore the Mighty Ruler of nations—for the preservation of our institutions, and the protection of our liberty and of our Union—to raise up from his ashes, another CLAY."

The marshals of the day then formed the long procession, which moved from Ashland, through Lexington, to the cemetery at the north of the city, where were deposited the remains of HENRY CLAY, TO REST TILL THE MORNING OF THE RESURRECTION.

It is suitable that some sentiment—and not a little—should be manifested in the community, at the exit from the world of so remarkable a man as HENRY CLAY. It is not every country nor every age that can boast of such a character. Great men there have been in this country and in others, besides Mr. Clay; but every man has his own peculiar mold. The mold of Mr. Clay's character was perfectly peculiar. We do not remember to have seen or read of any thing like it in all history. It was both plastic and elastic—plastic as being susceptible of influence by every touch of the world around, and elastic as having internal springs which responded to every touch from without. And there was a basis of GOODNESS, which was very sure to make those springs act in a right direction. But for this basis, the

other two attributes which we have named might be productive of the most pernicious results—might even be diabolical. These elements—the last and first two—are the triune constitution of character; but a healthy *morale* is the most important of the three. Doubtless, Mr. Clay had his sportive or impulsive springs of character, which bounded into acts, in his childhood, in his youth, and in his riper years, for which he might be sorry, and which, perhaps, would sometimes give pain to others. But the deep and strong power of natural goodness would restore him to its corrective influence. This goodness, lying at the bottom of a man's heart, prompting its impulses, controlling his conduct, and imparting its character to his deportment, was strikingly exemplified in Mr. Clay. It is a basis of character which has many important bearings, and produces important results. If a man is sympathetic, it proceeds from this; and sympathy branches out into innumerable forms, according to the nature of the object by which it is challenged. It may be pity for those in want or distress; it may be love of kindred, or love of country; it may be exhilaration with the joyful, or hilarity with the mirthful; it responds, in short, to all possible relations of the social state. It mounts even higher, spreads out into a larger sphere, when the heart is touched by the grace of God; for then it expands to a sympathy with a kingdom which is not of this world, and embraces not only all on earth, but all in heaven, and allies itself to Him who sits upon the throne of heaven. We have had evidence that Mr. Clay, especially in the latter years of his life, felt the power of this more holy sympathy, and enjoyed its higher and holier satisfactions.

But the distinguishing characteristic by which he has been longest and best known, and which has procured for him an ever-during fame, was his love of country, and his sympathy with those rights of man which are most essential to the perfection of the social state in its organized forms. In this wide and deep current flowed the great body of his affections, till they swept over the land of his birth, and reached all of human kind, far and near, civilized and barbarian. He was a PHILANTHROPIST in the highest, purest, and most comprehensive sense of the term; and, to crown all, he was a CHRISTIAN.

NOTE G—PAGE 292.

A LETTER FROM MR. CLAY ON DUELING.

"ASHLAND, August 1, 1844.

"GENTLEMEN: I duly received your letter of the 15th instant, on the subject of dueling, and I appreciate fully the friendly, pious, and patriotic motives which prompted you to address it to me. Pernicious as the practice undoubtedly is, I hope you will excuse me when I say there are other questions, in our public affairs, of much higher and more general importance. The victims or votaries of that practice are but few in number, and bear no comparison with the immense number of sufferers from the rejection of wise measures of national policy, or the adoption of those of an opposite character.

"I expressed in strong terms of condemnation my opinion against dueling, in a letter which I addressed to my constituents, in March, 1824, which is to be found in the published collection of my speeches. Again, within a few years past, I gave evidence of my strong disapprobation of it, by voting, in the Senate of the United States, for the bill to suppress dueling in the District of Columbia.

"With these proofs of my sentiments, I think, gentlemen, you ought to be satisfied. But you ask me, whether, if I were challenged to fight a duel, I would reject the invitation? Considering my age, which is now past sixty-seven, I feel that I should expose myself to ridicule, if I were to proclaim whether I would or would not fight a duel. It is certainly one of the most unlikely events that can possibly be imagined, and I can not conceive a case in which I should be provoked or tempted to go to the field of combat. But as I can not foresee all the contingencies which may possibly arise in the short remnant of my life, and for the reason which I have already stated, of avoiding any exposure of myself to ridicule, I can not reconcile it to my sense of propriety to make a declaration one way or the other.

"You have, gentlemen, done me some, but not full justice, in respect to the affair of the lamented Cilley. When I first obtained any knowledge of his difficulty with Mr. Graves, I did not then think there was the smallest occasion for a combat between them. I believed, from the first, that the matter would be amicably accommodated; and to that end all my ex-

ertions were directed. I did not know that it was not accommodated until the day when, and after the parties went out to fight. On that day I was confined to my room by illness, and it was altogether accidental that I obtained information that the parties had gone out. But I was neither informed as to the place or the hour of their meeting. Contrary to the impressions which you entertain, I did advise the employment of the police to arrest the parties, and to prevent the duel. The constables accordingly went out in search of them, but like myself, being ignorant of the time and place of their meeting, they mistook the route, and failed in the accomplishment of the object. If you would read attentively the whole of my correspondence with Mr. Wise, to which you have referred, you will find that it sustains the preceding statement.

"I am, gentlemen, with great respect, your frie[illegible]nd obedient servant,

"H. CLAY.

"Messrs. ALEX. PLUMER, and others."

NOTE H—Page 293.

When the death of Mr. Calhoun was announced in the Senate of the United States, April 1st, 1850, Mr. Clay seconded the resolutions of order for the funeral, which were offered by Mr. Butler, the colleague of Mr. Calhoun. We can not refrain from an extract from Mr. Clay's remarks on that occasion, considering what had been the relations of these two eminent men to each other for over thirty years, most of which time they had been political opponents, and sometimes, in the heat of public debate, not a little excited—disturbed, we might say—in their personal feelings. But they always had respect for each other, and were courteous.

* * * "My personal acquaintance with him" [Mr. Calhoun], said Mr. Clay, "commenced upward of thirty years ago. We entered at the same time the House of Representatives at the other end of this building. * * * Such, Mr. President, was the high estimate I formed of his transcendent talents, that, if at the end of his service in the executive department under Mr. Monroe, he had been called to the highest office in the government, I should have felt perfectly assured that, under his auspices, the honor, the prosperity, and the glory of our country would have been safely placed.

"But, sir, he is gone! No more shall we witness from yonder seat the flashes of that keen and penetrating eye, darting through this chamber. No more shall we witness that torrent of clear, concise, and compact logic, poured out from his lips, which, if it did not always carry conviction to our judgment, commanded our great admiration. Those eyes and those lips are closed forever! * * *

"He possessed a genius of the highest order. In felicity of generalization of the subject of which his mind treated, I have seen him surpassed by no one, and the charm and captivating influence of his colloquial powers have been felt by all who have conversed with him. I was his senior, Mr. President, in years—in nothing else. According to the course of nature, I ought to have preceded him. It has been decreed otherwise. I

know that I shall linger here only a short time, and shall soon follow him.

"And how brief, how short is the period allotted even to the youngest among us! Sir, ought we not to profit by the contemplation of this melancholy occasion? Ought we not to draw from it the conclusion how unwise it is to indulge in the acerbity of unbridled debate? How unbecoming, if not presumptuous, in us who are the tenants of an hour in this earthly abode, to wrestle and struggle together with a violence which would not be justifiable even if it were our perpetual home. * * * I trust we shall all be instructed by the eminent virtues and merits of his exalted character, and be taught by his bright example to fulfill our great public duties by the lights of our own judgment and by the dictates of our own consciences, as he did, according to his honest and best conceptions of those duties, faithfully and to the last."

CORRESPONDENCE OF HENRY CLAY.

1843 TO 1851.

WITH COLLATERAL LETTERS AND NOTES.

EDITED BY THOMAS B. STEVENSON.*

PREFACE.

Of the papers composing this collection, two, only, were prepared for the public eye. One of these was published in a widely circulated newspaper in 1848, and copied by other prints; but the other was suppressed in the publishing office to which the writer intrusted its introduction to the public. Of the residue of letters, direct and collateral, none were written with a view to publication, and none have been hitherto published.

Intended only for private information, it may be deemed due to propriety to justify this public use of them. The justification is, that it is believed they will prove interesting, instructive, useful, and acceptable to the public; while their publication will neither violate confidence, nor weaken the guaranties which guard and protect the sacred sanctity of private epistolary intercourse. They have been winnowed with affectionate care, the omitted paragraphs being substituted by asterisks. The omitted matter, however, for the most part, related to current or transient events, to business, and to men and things, invested with no permanent public interest, and therefore, in my judgment, proper to be excised. And it may be added, as an admirable characteristic of Mr. Clay's correspondence, that while it was free and frank, uniting the charms of freshness, ease, and sincerity, it was at the same time a model of propriety and decorum. In his most intimate communings, when the inner man was brought out, he indulged none of those ungentle expressions and angry vituperations which make men of taste recoil at their publication. He displayed a calm composure, the out-growth of a repose of soul, which enabled him to subdue the bursts of malignant passion; and he encountered the provoking scenes of life and the ex-

* The remainder of this volume is a contribution from Thomas B. Stevenson, Esq., of Maysville, Kentucky, who, as the correspondence will show, was admitted to intimate and confidential relations with Mr. Clay, and for several years had much intercourse with him, by letter and otherwise.

asperating conduct of men, in a spirit of moderation and forbearance, that reflected dignity on human nature. Of this, abundant proofs will be found in the following letters; and not one of the suppressed passages, disfigured by any undignifying blemish, would reveal aught to the contrary.

The least important of these letters are not without a certain degree of public interest; while many of them are more valuable for the intimations and argumentative statements of opinions on important topics, on some of which, it is believed, he was never required, in the performance of official duties, publicly to express himself. And it has long been conceded, that such expressions, made in the sincerity of familiar and trusted intercourse, are of the most instructive and reliable elements of which the fabrics of authentic history may be constructed.

The publication of the letters, direct and collateral, relating to the competition for the Presidency in 1848, and more especially regarding his attitude toward Ohio, with the notes appended, is believed to be due as a justification of Mr. Clay's motives and conduct, with respect to which he felt more than his usual, though no less than a natural and noble-minded keenness of sensibility; and, moreover, it is not doubted that while it will prove instructive to the public, it will also subserve the ends of political justice, and promote a spirit of obedience to the invocations of political wisdom and political honesty, in supporting the integrity of political principle.

These considerations alone, without the incentive of injunctions, obedience to which was but a sacred duty, have induced and now serve to justify this publication, and in a form which the editor deems most appropriate to the vindication of historical truth.

The incorporation in this collection of a series of cotemporary letters, with explanatory notes, relating to Mr. Clay's attitude toward Kentcky, in the same memorable and lamentable contest of 1848, has been considered; but it is hoped such a contribution to the truth of history and the ends of justice, will be made by some one, then a resident and actor in Kentucky, more competent, if not more willing, to execute the task.

The illustration of a signal, even though brief, period in the long and illustrious public career of one—the music of whose sonorous eloquence, startling the panting sons of liberty with hope and courage from Olympus to the Andes, is still heard ringing and reverberating in every clime of freedom, the splendor of whose many mighty deeds, the practical beneficence of whose wise policy, the vital energy of whose undying principles, and the colossal grandeur of whose unexaggerated character, have consecrated his name immortal—would be but worthy homage to blended goodness and greatness, from one of his admiring and grateful countrymen, who feels a just pride and an honest exultation that the glory and strength of our blessed Union are inseparably linked with the imperishable fame of Henry Clay.

T. B. S.

Maysville, Kentucky, February 4, 1856.

CORRESPONDENCE OF HENRY CLAY.

LETTER I.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, July 19, 1843

MY DEAR SIR—The news from Louisiana is bad enough. From Tennessee I daily receive the most satisfactory and cheering accounts. I agree with you, that on the result of that election much of the future depends. From Pennsylvania, from Georgia, North Carolina, and Massachusetts, I get good accounts.

An editorial article will appear to-day in the *Observer*, on Burnet's letter, which may be worth copying in the *Commonwealth*.*

I think we shall not do as badly in Fayette as you apprehend.

With cordial regard, etc.

LETTER II.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, August 29, 1843.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor, but I have not yet seen in the *Journal* the article to which you refer. I am surprised that it should have excited disagreeable feelings in Mr. Crittenden. The use of his name in connection with the office of governor was founded upon his great and just popularity, and certainly ought to excite any other feelings than those of dissatisfaction. He has only to emphatically say No, and I suppose he would not be further urged.†

I sincerely hope that a good selection of a candidate may be made; but whether it be Mr. Owsley, or any other, I think that a new election of Del-

* The Hon. Jacob Burnet, of Ohio, had published a letter in the *Cincinnati Gazette*, saying that while he and Judge McLean would vote for Mr. Clay, the *Abolitionists* would vote for no resident of a slave State, which was probably meant as a slant to favor Judge McLean's presidential aspirations. The article in the *Observer and Reporter*, a newspaper at Lexington, which he sometimes wrote *Observer*, and sometimes *Reporter*, defined the true grounds of selecting the candidate to be such as regarded sound national principles, without reference to his residence, etc. The *Commonwealth* newspaper, published at Frankfort, was then edited by me.—T. B. S.

† Mr. Crittenden was extremely averse at that time to being elected governor.—T. B. S.

egates in October is a desirable proceeding. Without prompt and general concurrence, however, in that course, it can not succeed.

My letters from the eastward continue to breathe a good spirit and great confidence. I do not think that our provokingly bad luck in Kentucky has produced as much discouragement as we feared.

As I expect to see you next week in Frankfort, I must reserve for that occasion further communications. Meantime, I am,

Truly yours.

LETTER III.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, July 18, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 13th inst., with its inclosure. I have sent a slip from the *Bay State Democrat* to Mr. Brownlow, the source of the information respecting Mr. Webster, published in that paper, and requested him to correct the error.* It will be better that the correction and the error should have a common origin. If he fail or decline to do it, I will adopt some other suitable mode to have it rectified.

I am inclined to think that you gentlemen of the press do not lash Butler † sufficiently for his silence, for near thirty years, in regard to the slander of the Kentucky troops. During all that time he has been zealously supporting the slanderer—supporting all his violent measures—supporting his lieutenant, Martin Van Buren; and he is now supporting his other lieutenant, James K. Polk. During all that time, also, he has been opposing the measures of public policy, which a majority of the people of Kentucky desired, and opposing me. Now, after the lapse of near thirty years of silence on his part, he comes out and says, for the first time, that he did not approve of the slander upon the Kentucky troops. He says this when, for the first time, he is appealing to the people of Kentucky for their suffrages. Why has he been so long silent? Why has he always supported the slanderer of every thing that is Kentuckian? And what is the difference between concurring in the slander and indorsing the slanderer? We should have a pretty time of it with one of Jackson's lieutenants at Washington and another at Frankfort, and the old man in his dotage at the Hermitage dictating to both.

I am, faithfully, your friend and obedient servant.

* A statement imputing to Mr. Clay the use of indecorous language with respect to Mr. Webster.—T. B. S.

† Colonel (afterward, in the Mexican war, General) William O. Butler, then the Democratic candidate for Governor of Kentucky; and, in 1848, the Democratic nominee for the Vice Presidency, on the ticket which presented General Cass for the Presidency. But before the date of Mr. Clay's letter, the press had already forced Butler to disclaim the slanders. See C. S. Morehead's letter to me in the *Commonwealth*.—T. B. S.

LETTER IV.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, August 12, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your letter informing me that a new and revised edition is about to be published of Dr. Bascom's pamphlet in respect to the divisions which have unhappily arisen in the Methodist Church. I perused a copy of the first edition with very great satisfaction, and consider it as distinguished by uncommon ability. Besides the particular questions involved in the controvesy between the Southern and Northern sections of the Methodist Church, it treats of other subjects (slavery and abolition) in a masterly manner, and well adapted to make a deep and lasting impression upon all patriotic and religious minds open to the reception of great and important truths. The intention of Dr. Bascom to divide the principal topics of the work into suitable chapters, will be an agreeable facility to the reader of it.

An unwarrantable interpretation has been given to a letter which I addressed several months ago to Dr. Boothe, in regard to the menaced separation of the Methodist Church. It was my purpose, in that letter, to confine myself strictly to an expression of my great regret of the consequences to the Church and to the Union which I apprehended from the separation, without intimating any opinion whatever as to which of the two parties to the controversy was in the wrong. I understand that my letter has been construed to imply that I thought the Southern division of the Church in error, which is certainly not the opinion that I do really entertain.

My profound regrets on account of the division of the Church, *for the cause which brought it about*, remain undiminished. I know that there are very high authorities* for cherishing the belief that the event will add strength, instead of creating danger to our political Union. I anxiously hope that experience will demonstrate the correctness of that, and the fallacy of my opinion.

I am, respectfully, your friend and obedient servant.

LETTER V.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

"NEW ORLEANS, December 19, 1846.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your letter of the 10th instant, in respect to the approaching senatorial election in Kentucky. The subject has occasioned me some concern, not to say vexation.

* See Report to the Convention of Southern Methodist Ministers, held in Louisville in the summer of 1845.—T. B. S.

I took a formal and final leave of the Senate more than four years ago. I not only have no desire, but I entertain a positive disinclination, to return to it. I have given no authority nor countenance to the use of my name as a candidate. I could not reappear, as a member of the Senate, without at least an apparent inconsistency; and I can not conceive a state of things in which I would consent to go back.

My wish is, that an election should be made from among the avowed candidates for the office; and although I regard them all as able and competent to serve the State with credit and fidelity, and all as my friends. If I had myself the election in my own hands, I should give my suffrage to one of them. I need not, nor would it be proper to, indicate which.*

I have not said that, if elected, I would not serve, because such a prior declaration, in advance of an election, seemed to me unbecoming and indelicate; but if my anxious desire is regarded, and if my feelings and interests are at all consulted, the attention of the General Assembly will be wholly withdrawn from me, and concentrated upon some other person.

To this effect, in substance, previous to the receipt of your letter, I wrote to General Combs and James Harlan, Esq.

We have no news here, except the arrival yesterday of General Scott, *en route* to Mexico.

I am your friend and obedient servant.

LETTER VI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, July 23, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR—I have to trouble you with a little friendly commission, which, I am sure, you will take pleasure in executing.

Captain G. W. Cutter, of Covington, was among the persons who last spoke to your departed friend, my lamented son,† and received from him a brace of pistols, which he has safely delivered to me.

I desire to present to him some memorial, which, I have concluded, shall be a ring, containing some hair of my beloved son. I have not been able to procure one at the jewelers' shops in Lexington. May I ask, therefore, the favor of you to get one at Cincinnati (at a cost of some fifteen or twenty dollars), to have the inclosed hair or a part of it placed in it, and present it to the captain on my behalf?

* Many desired (and the friends of some candidates feared) that Mr. Clay would return to the Senate. He repelled all overtures on the subject. After an animated and protracted competition between the friends of Judge Underwood, Governor Letcher, and Governor Metcalfe, the former was chosen.—T. B. S.

† Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Clay, jr., who fell gloriously in the battle of Buena Vista, February 22, 1847. The commission intrusted to me was executed satisfactorily to all parties.—T. B. S.

I go hence to-morrow to the White Sulphur Springs in Virginia, and will, on my return, pay the cost of the ring when you inform me of it.

I write in haste, but ever with assurances of the faithful regard and esteem of Your friend.

LETTER VII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, December 2, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR—An absence of a week at Louisville has delayed my acknowledgment of the receipt of your favor of the 22d ult.

I am greatly obliged by the letter of Mr. Noble, which you inclosed. It is full of good sense and good feeling.

As to myself and the future, if there be not such demonstrations as I ought to respect, I may be compelled to decline any use of my name. Perhaps that is really best for the country and for me. I am most unwilling to be thought to desire a nomination for the Presidency. If better can be done without my name than with it, for God's sake, let me be passed by. But if I am to be used, I desire that I may be brought forward under the most auspicious circumstances.

* * * * * * * *

I write hastily. My letters, in respect to my late speech,* almost overwhelm me. Your friend.

LETTER VIII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Private.*)

WASHINGTON, February 19, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—

* * * * * * * *

Nevertheless, I maintain my passive position; neither, for the present, consenting to nor refusing the use of my name, etc.

On reaching home in March, and after a careful survey of the whole ground of my duty to our country, to our principles, and to myself, I may finally decide.

I am afraid Congress will do nothing to end the war. Its moral courage has increased since the commencement of the session, but, I apprehend, has not reached the point of decision and definitive action.

On all these matters, however, you are better advised by other friends.

On business of a private nature I go to Philadelphia next week, and hope to reach home by or before the 25th March.

Your friend.

* His speech at Lexington, November 13, 1847, against the Mexican War.—T. B. S.

LETTER IX.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Confidential.*)

ASHLAND, April 12, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—Fatigued with writing ten or a dozen letters this afternoon, I have got my son John to act as my amanuensis in acknowledging the receipt of your favor of the eighth instant.

You will have seen, before this reaches you, that I have published a note in the *Observer and Reporter* expressing my willingness to have my name submitted to the consideration of the Whig Convention in June. I have made in that note a full and candid exposition of the motives which governed me, and I have nothing to add to it. Having taken this ground, I mean henceforward to abstain from writing any political letters for publication, whatever the consequences may be. I have adopted this resolution, not from any desire to conceal my opinions, but from a perfect conviction, derived from sad experience, that all such letters, from perversion or misrepresentation, do more harm than good. It is the less necessary that I should write any letters, because my opinions, upon all subjects, have been plainly expressed, or are to be plainly inferred from my public acts and public speeches. This course, I am sure, will meet the general approbation of my friends, for many of them have beseeched me most anxiously to adopt it. I hope I may meet with you in the course of the spring or summer, in which case I think I can satisfy you of its correctness.

I received and have answered the letter of Gov. Bebb;* and I also received, and will, to-morrow, answer the letter from Mr. Forrer.†

I never for a moment entertained the opinion that I could be elected, if elected at all, without the concurrence of any of the slave States. If I should be the candidate, my opinion is that I would obtain the votes of Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Maryland; and there is a fair prospect of Louisiana and Florida. Assuming, what I think may be fairly done, that I should obtain the votes of all the States which gave me their suffrages before, and that of New York, of which I entertain no doubt, there would be still a deficiency of some five or six votes. These, if obtained at all, must be derived from Pennsylvania, Indiana, Georgia, Louisiana, and Florida, and perhaps Michigan.

In Massachusetts, or rather in Boston, there is an unsatisfactory state of things. Some of our friends there have been tickled with the feather of the Vice Presidency, and hence a Taylor clique has been formed in that city. But according to my information, it does not extend much beyond its limits.

* William Bebb, the Governor of Ohio.—See his letter, No. xviii.—T. B. S.

† Samuel Forrer, of Dayton, a gentleman of high official and personal distinction, and who, unlike Bebb, proved true and constant.—See his letter, No. xix.—T. B. S.

I have just heard that the Whigs of the New York Legislature, with only some five or six dissentients, have nominated me for the Presidency.

Letcher was here last night, and is very well.

I am, truly, your friend.

LETTER X.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Private.*)

ASHLAND, May 20, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—After putting a letter for you in the post-office to-day I received your two favors of the 18th, but not the call for the People's Convention, in the *Herald*, to which you refer. I regard it only as an evidence of an unsettled, uneasy, and dissatisfied condition of the public mind. Any such movement can not become sufficiently general to influence materially the Convention at Philadelphia.

Some of your communications (which I shall regard as strictly confidential) greatly surprise me. Whatever I might do, if I had not consented to submit my name to the Convention, I am constrained now to abide by that act. I am inclined to believe, or rather to hope, that things will appear not quite so bad when it assembles. So much depends on its complexion, so much upon developments during its deliberations, and so much upon the Baltimore Convention* and its nomination, that it is very difficult to provide beforehand for all contingencies. I shall have a long interview with Harlan before he goes. I shall deeply regret if you can not go; and sincerely hope that you may yet be able to do so.†

* * * * * * * *

If there should be a time when it may be necessary for me to express any opinion about the Wilmot Proviso, for publication, that time has not yet arrived.

Your friend.

LETTER XI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, June 14, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I hasten to express my deep regret with all the contents of your favor of the 12th which relate to yourself. I had previously seen the annunciaton of your retirement from the *Atlas*,‡ but I was uninformed

* The Democratic National Convention, which soon after nominated General Cass for the Presidency.—T. B. S.

† Uncontrollable circumstances precluded my attendance. I was only an alternate delegate, and my principal attended.—T. B. S.

‡ The Cincinnati *Daily Atlas*, a newspaper edited by me.—T. B. S.

of the causes. These inspire me, if possible, with more respect than ever, for your independence, the purity of your principles, and your character.

Are you right in thinking of returning from Cincinnati to Frankfort? In that great and growing city, what may you not do? in the latter, what can you? You have abilities for eminent success at the bar; why not turn your attention to it?

Wherever you may be, or whatever you may do, you have my best wishes, and an anxious desire to serve you in any way in my power.

The less said, the better, about the result of the late Whig Convention at Philadelphia. I believe that I can bear it with much less regret than my warm-hearted friends. Whatever I do feel is principally on their account, and on account of the principles which were at issue, and which have been so little regarded. I have not lost one hour's sleep, nor one meal of victuals. Accustomed as I have been to disappointments, and to afflictions, they disturb now, less than ever, my composure. I hope that I derive some support from a resignation to the will of the great Disposer of all events.

There is one topic connected with the late Convention, in regard to which I feel a little curiosity, and that is the unexpected course of the Ohio delegation. Among the considerations which determined me to consent to submit my name to the Convention, one of the most powerful arose from assurances which I received, in every form, and from the highest sources, (the Governor* among them,) that I would receive the support of Ohio. Clay and Corwin, and Corwin and Clay, were said to be identical, and all the delegates, chosen for the one or the other, making together a large majority, were to go for me, if he were to decline, as he did. Can you tell me, my dear sir, after all these strong assurances, how it was that I got but one vote in the delegation? I was told, too, that Ohio could not possibly go for General Taylor. And yet those who probably had it in their power to secure the nomination of a candidate whom they could carry their State for, suffered one to be nominated for whom, agreeably to the representations made to me, there was no possibility of Ohio going.

My curiosity on this subject is rather of the historical kind; for I have no complaints nor reproaches to make. My only regret is that I should have been led into error. Most certainly, if I had anticipated such a vote as has been actually given by the Ohio delegation, I never would have consented that my name should be presented to the Convention.

I observe what you say as to objects which should engage the attention of my future life. I shall give to those subjects full consideration, with an anxious wish that the remnant of my days may be so employed as to justify the confidence and friendship with which I have been so greatly and so long honored.

Reciprocating all your kind feelings and friendly prayers and wishes, I remain faithfully yours.

* Governor Bebb.—T. B. S.

LETTER XII.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO MR. CLAY.*

CINCINNATI, June 19, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—Your precious favor of the 14th was duly received; and I thank you sincerely for the kind interest you manifest in my personal welfare.

* * * * * * *

I am filled with pride in contemplating the lofty and self-poised position in which you stand respecting the result of the late Whig National Convention at Philadelphia. And, like you, I regret the result more on account of the principles involved, and which were so shamefully disregarded, in the search for that new-fangled thing which, in the brainless cant of the day, is flippantly termed "*availability*," than on your own; for though I loved you as a man, and revered you for those great statesman-like qualities which have attracted to you the admiration of the world, I desired to see you in the Presidential chair, not merely for the sake of doing appropriate honor to you, but more, far more, for the sake of the country. As for you, the past is secure, and office could add little, if any thing, to your solid fame. You can rise proudly aloft, far out of reach of the effect even of the ingratitude of your late political friends; but the Whig party, I fear, never can recover from the evil influence of the monstrous, demoralizing precedent it has just sanctioned, in preferring for the highest civil office of the government a mere warrior, whose principles were designedly veiled, and whose qualifications were untried, to a statesman of known principles and admitted qualifications! This precedent can not stand the test of scrutiny and of time, and perhaps you are right in saying "the less said, the better," about it.

I feel most poignantly the burning sarcasm of your "historic curiosity," in regard to the course of the Ohio delegation. When I wrote you last, I did not know how they had voted, and even then supposed a majority of them had voted for you, and that some from New York had deserted you. But New York, which some had denounced as huckstering, trading, vascillating, stood firm; while the Ohio delegation (all but one) deserted even before the hour of battle! I have no apology for this. Nor do I even yet satisfactorily understand it. Not fully understanding the course of the Ohio delegation, a conclusive judgment against them would be premature, if not unjust; but from what I have learned thus far, I can see no escape for them from the imputation of lack of sagacity or integrity; and they certainly must be allowed too much intelligence to be deficient in the former. Not one of them has yet been here, and I have heard no explanation of their conduct from their side.

* * * * * * *

* This is copied from the rough draught kept by me. The original to Mr. Clay may vary somewhat in language, but not in substance.—T. B. S.

I wrote you a month or more ago, that the movement for Scott, impelled as I then believed, by the ultra opposition of Ohio to slavery extension, was more formidable than it seemed. This and other symptoms of defection, of which I gave you the earliest intimations and evidences, induced me to suggest that a contingent power to withdraw your name from the consideration of the Convention, should be put in Harlan's hands. Mortified as I am at the result, I am now better content; having secured in the ballotings a test of men and sections, that may be useful hereafter.

Whatever you may hear from the hurrah-ites, the nomination goes down very badly in this State; and the delegates will have an up-hill business of it yet with the discussions that *must* ensue in regard to their course in the National Convention.

The State Convention is in session now at Columbus. As things now stand, Taylor can't carry Ohio; and it is believed his loss will average at least one hundred to a county—say ten thousand in the State, besides the body of the Quakers. The accessions from the Democrats, I think, will not reimburse either loss. A friend in New York writes me flatly that Taylor can't carry that State. I think no rational estimate of probable future results can be made till the effect of the demonstrations at Columbus, Utica, and Worcester, be seen.

As to the Presidential campaign, though I have a weak stomach for the fight, I must, on two grounds, go for Taylor; first, because, having gone into the Convention with you, I am bound in honor by the result; and second, because, in every aspect, I prefer Taylor to Cass, and can see no means so likely to defeat Cass now as running Taylor—though I am not yet entirely satisfied that will be absolutely availing. I admit these are narrow grounds for a thinking man to act on; but they are the best left me to stand on, and that very reflection makes me so much more resentful toward the managers who have thrust the Whigs into such an unsatisfactory position—or in other words, have acted with such disregard of principle.

I think we are likely to lose our State elections here, as well as the Presidential. * * * As ever yours.

LETTER XIII.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO THOMAS CORWIN.

CINCINNATI, Thursday, June 29, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I have received your favor of the 23d inst. My impression still is, that the chances are against us in Ohio, in both State and national elections. I hear sober-minded Whigs saying, in an under tone, they would be glad to compromise in Ohio for a Whig Legislature, and give the Locos the Governorship and Cass the electoral vote for the Presidency. I am not going to delude myself or my friends, if I know it. I

think we must all agree that, to carry Ohio for any Whig candidate for the Presidency, it is essential that we all pull together, and all interests of the party unite. But all don't pull together—all don't unite. The Quaker Whigs are lost—the Reserve Whigs are many of them lost—the Green County Whigs, with their neighboring allies, are many of them lost, and nearly all of them cold—the Miami tribes are lacking in enthusiasm—and then this "Free Territory party" (the Whig Barnburners of Ohio), have made formidable head. I might argue to you, as you do to me, the folly of all these people; I might join you in asking them *cui bono?* I might tell them they are playing into the hands of Cass, in effect, as indeed is the fact; but what does it signify if I do? The disaffected won't listen to you or me. ——— and ———, and many more men of still greater influence, *will* hazard the evils you apprehend. I have labored with them both, and with others, employing the very arguments and suggesting all the views you suggest; but in vain with many of them. As to indemnity from Loco-foco ranks, I don't see any evidence that we shall get that. Here and there a *pseudo* Loco *says* he will go for Taylor; but I *know* of more Whigs who won't go for Taylor, than I *hear* of Locos who will.

You seem joyed at Van Buren's nomination by the Barnburners; and perhaps it may aid us in New York. It certainly will, *if he don't take the State from both Cass and Taylor*, which, it is seriously apprehended by some Whigs here, he will. As to the effect of his running in Ohio—though at first blush it might seem to be favorable to Taylor—some calculate that he will take off more Whigs than Locos. You can judge of this better than I. My mode of writing letters to friends, is to give present facts and impressions at the time of writing. In the transition state of sentiment and feeling pervading all parties, no calculation is safe now—nothing is certain but that both parties are virtually disbanded, and new combinations and organizations are in process of formation. I now believe that Van Buren will damage Taylor more than Cass in Ohio. The disaffected Whigs argue thus—and with a troublesome show of plausibility:

"Taylor's *nomination* was urged, without committing him to Whig principles, on the assumption that Whig principles were dead or dormant. The nomination was made by a Convention which, so far from re-affirming Whig principles, refused to consider any propositions looking thitherward, and only forbore kicking out of it the factious delegates who wished such a re-affirmation proclaimed; and therefore (argue the disaffected), if all this be so—if Whig principles be not in issue, at least the question of excluding slavery from new territory is a present, practical, living issue, paramount to Whig principles, even if they were not dead or dormant; and why, then, in such a state of facts, should we not go for Van Buren, an affirmative representative of this living, imminent, paramount, practical

question, in preference to one who, in the best view we can take of him, is only less exceptionable than Cass."

* * * * * * * *

I expect you will, in spite of yourself, have to take the stump in Ohio. If there was not so much to commiserate in the conception, I should amuse myself by the fancy of seeing the author of a certain anti-war speech —the leader of the anti-war party—the moral hero of the times—pounding, grinding, compounding, and igniting brimstone, charcoal, and saltpetre, for the edification of those who once thought themselves enlightened, and purified, and rendered better men by the aforesaid speech. It is not fair, to be sure, that the "spontaneous combustion" don't go off on its own hook; but the thing *must* go, and *you* will have to sweat at the mortar and pestle, grinding the crude elements into the villainous compound called gunpowder-popularity, in favor of that most euphonious of all names since the invention of nomenclature—"*Old Zack*." This, to be sure, is not "the entertainment to which we were invited;" but if combustion won't go on spontaneously, why, we must sweat and make it go. Sweat, you know, according to an old law, is the price of bread; and we, poor devils, must sweat to make Zachary prime minister of the White House Kitchen.

I slept one night at Ashland, less soundly than its illustrious occupant. As to the effect of the doings of the Philadelphia Convention on Mr. Clay, his betrayers can feel no interest in knowing. The most they have a right to expect—as I imagine it is the most they will get—is, that he remains submissive to an event that is irrevocable, and gives no countenance to the third-party designs formed on him by Whigs, such as have made head by Locos on Van Buren. Those who, by one stab, have committed both parricide and suicide, may heat themselves burning gunpowder till November; he will cool his heels and compose his heart long after that, in the shades of Ashland. He loves his principles and his country still, and will ever love them. They call on him now, however, to assure the country of Zachary's whiggery. Perhaps he might, if that was Zachary's theory of making the race; but as it is not, such an assurance would be intrusive, if not injurious. Besides, in these times of commercial politics, ought he to endorse a bill, the payee himself refusing to sign? Moreover, does *availability* need aid of *unavailability?* These be bitter things; but there is a great deal of human nature even in a man capable of bearing the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Now, my dear sir, if availability don't happen to turn out available, I think your prediction will be verified, that half-civilized Kentucky will relapse into the utter barbarism of Locofocoism; to which I will add that half, or not half-faithful Ohio, will keep her sister company; and treachery and parricide can then console one another. Who has a sore head, has a right to scratch and growl; and I have seen no explanation *yet*, in regard to the conduct of the Ohio and Kentucky delegations, consistent with the sagacity or integrity of either.

* * * * * * * *

LETTER XIV.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO JAMES B. CLAY.

CINCINNATI, July 19, 1848.

DEAR SIR—Yours, erroneously dated 19th, post-marked 18th, reached me this morning.

* * * * * * * *

So far as my opinion goes (if it be not deemed impertinent, unasked, to offer it), I have no doubt Mr. Crittenden desired the nomination of General Taylor, on the ground that he believed no one else could be elected by the Whigs; but that neither in public nor in private, he used any means to effect it incompatible with friendship toward your father, or with what he owed to himself as a gentleman. And I must do him the justice to say that, though I was entirely dissatisfied with the reasons for his belief as to the superior availabilty of Taylor, and still more with the grounds on which he was willing to take up Taylor, not manifesting what I deemed a due regard for the great principles which I thought involved; yet he uniformly and earnestly professed to me his decided preference for Mr. Clay over all men, and his purpose to fight under his flag, live or die, while ever it was in the field. If, while Mr. Clay's flag was in the field, he endeavored to haul it down, or to give predominance to any other, I shall be compelled either to doubt the sincerity of his avowals to me, or to believe that his feelings and preferences, no less than his judgment or his principles, underwent a great change.

I will thank you to say to your father what I have omitted to explain, that I have not yet written to the New York *Tribune* on the subject on which I voluntarily proposed to write; but from no slackened purpose or zeal in the matter. On reflection and inquiry, after returning here, I thought it best to give the Ohio delegation ample time to explain their conduct to their constituents, before I arraigned any of them, even indirectly, and by all reasonable calculation they should have done so ere now. But not one of them has defended as yet. I have not seen L'Hommedieu, the delegate from this city, since his return, but I understand that he wrote an explanation of the course of the Ohio delegation for the *Gazette*, which was suppressed in that office. I did not learn the nature of the explanation, but have been informed that he is not satisfied with himself. I have expected also, before now, an interview with Campbell, another delegate, and the nominator of Scott, whom I had severely arraigned in private correspondence. He promises to meet me in a few days.

* * * * * * * *

I have seen Governor Bebb, and had some pretty fierce words with him on his faithlessness and vacillation toward Mr. Clay. He gave me, in a defiant tone, his full permission to publish his letter urging Mr. Clay to let his name go to the Convention. I will use it time enough for him, and shall certainly, in good time, handle him and some others rather ungently.

As between Taylor and Cass, in any aspect, I can not hesitate supporting the former; but that support shall be so qualified as to reserve my old principles and attachments, and, besides, in no way to restrain the just vengeance I shall assuredly take on those heartless men who have betrayed personal friendship as well as disregarded sound principles; and in this category I include some of Kentucky as well as of Ohio.

Yours, truly.

LETTER XV.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Private and Confidential.*)

ASHLAND, August 5, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I returned home yesterday from the Estill Springs, where I received your favor of the 26th ult., with the speech of Mr. Campbell* accompanying it, for which I thank you. That speech, connected with a letter which I have received from Ohio from a particular friend, throws some light on the course of the Ohio delegation. It appears that it was controlled by ——— ———, who was himself controlled by a clique at Washington of members of Congress. As the delegation could not be prevailed upon to go directly for General Taylor, the next best thing for him was to take it from me, throw it away upon General Scott, and thus indirectly advance the interests of General Taylor.

I have received a letter from General Scott, in which he writes to me:

"The day after I landed, a distinguished public man from a wing of the Capitol—a friend of yours—passing by, got out of the train to speak to me. I stated my impressions and wishes to him, and was astonished to hear him say, that your friends in Congress, with few exceptions—Berrien and Botts, but no Kentuckian, were two of them—had given you up on some calculation of a want of availability! I promptly said, if I could be flattered into the belief that my name on the same ticket (below yours) would add the vote of a single State, I might be considered as at the service of the party, and *authorized* him to say so on his return to Washington."

Thus you see a false suggestion as to those who were friendly to me in Congress, and the suppression of the truth as to the willingness of General Scott to run as a candidate for the Vice Presidency on the ticket with me. I believe, indeed, that it was represented at the Philadelphia Convention that he would not consent to run with me. I can not conjecture who the distinguished public man is to whom he refers from the Capitol.

You ask me what I think of the Compromise bill.† Its fate in the House of Representatives supersedes the necessity of my expressing any

* Hon. Lewis D. Campbell, a delegate, and since a distinguished member of Congress.—T. B. S.

† Mr. Clayton's Compromise bill, in substance proposing to make a case on the Slavery question, to be tried by the Supreme Court.—T. B. S.

opinion about it; but I will say that I think it merited its fate. It settled nothing; but covering the sore with a thin plaster, it left it to fester, and to break out with more alarm and violence than ever. I wish the question was fairly settled; but that can not, perhaps ought not to be done, without a retrocession of the territory, or the preservation of it in the condition in which it now is as to slavery.

I observe what you say as to the violent language of the partisans of General Taylor and Mr. Crittenden towards me, in consequence of my silence. It does not disturb my equanimity, nor will it drive me from the even tenor of my way. All my solicitude now, in regard to myself, is to preserve untarnished my humble fame, and I mean to be the exclusive judge of the best means to accomplish that object. Neither temporary popularity, nor unpopularity, will shake me.

I regret extremely the effect upon the honest Whig masses in Ohio of the Philadelphia nomination. From all I hear, the State must be lost on the Presidential election, if it be possible to save the State elections. So many Whigs in that State attach a vital and absorbing influence to the question of Free Territory, that I do not see how they can fail to avail themselves of an opportunity to vote for a candidate coinciding with them, if such a one shall be presented. And the proceedings in Congress on that subject, with Mr. Corwin's able and eloquent speech, must increase that tendency. How indeed can Mr. Corwin support either Taylor or Cass? Will he support Taylor against his own convictions?

My son James showed me your letter to him.

I should be glad to see your letter to the *Tribune*,* and to hear what Mr. Corwin says in answer to that you addressed to him.

I am, truly, your friend.

LETTER XVI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Private.*)

ASHLAND, August 14, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I was extremely sorry to learn, by your letter of the 10th inst., the alarming illness of your child, which I sincerely hope may be spared to you, notwithstanding your fears.

My friend in Ohio (Mr. —— ——, of Lancaster) attributes to ——— the controlling influence which determined the course of the Ohio delegation; he himself being gained over by the influence of the Congressional clique at Washington. That is now my opinion. With that view he prevailed on the twenty delegates to go together, and to promise that none

* Mr. Clay, after the nomination of General Taylor, was extremely concerned as to his political relations to Ohio. I *volunteered* a letter to the *Tribune*, justifying his position, his motives, and conduct, which gratified him much. See Letter XVII.—T. B. S.

would break unless all did so. With that view, also, he opposed, as Mr. ——— states, any appointment of a committee to confer with the delegates from other States.

I suspect that the distinguished friend of mine, as General Scott calls him, to whom he communicated his willingness to run as Vice President on a ticket with me, was G. Duncan,* who was in New York about the time of the General's arrival from Mexico. General Scott's letter to me is not marked private nor confidential; and I think you might say, in your letter to the Tribune, "that you have had the most satisfactory evidence that General Scott was willing to run as a candidate for the Vice Presidency on a ticket with me, and that that fact was not disclosed to the members of the Philadelphia Convention by the member of Congress who was authorized to make it known."

The retrocession of New Mexico and California, I did not suppose to be at present practicable; but if the question to which they have given rise, should long remain unsettled, and the existing excitement and agitation should continue and increase, I should not be surprised if public opinion should finally take that direction. If the South were wise, it would yield the point in dispute, even if, contrary to my opinion, it was with her. In the mean time, many of the friends of the principle that free territory should remain free, are putting themselves in a position full of embarrassment. They think it is the great question of the day, over-ruling and superseding all other questions. How then can they vote against a Presidential candidate who agrees with them, and for another, who differs from them, on that paramount question? I, who do not attach the same importance to that question, feel no such embarrassment.

I am excessively bored (even from Ohio!) to come out and *endorse* General Taylor. As if he had not spoken in a way that all may comprehend him! As if it were not enough that I should submit quietly to the decision of the Philadelphia Convention! Suppose I *could* endorse him, and being elected, he should totally disappoint Whig hopes, would I not be justly liable to the reproaches of any one that I might have misled?

North Carolina was one of the States which was to have gone for him by spontaneous combustion, and what has she done? Governor Morehead [of that State] told Judge Robertson that she would have given me a majority of twelve thousand.

The Whig clique at Washington totally mistook the character of the Whig party, as it once was. You have correctly described it. It is not a gunpowder party.

If Congress has risen without an adjustment of the slave question, I think the future full of uncertainty. Mr. Van Buren will, I believe, get a

* Hon. Garnett Duncan, a representative in Congress from the Louisville (Ky.) district. General Scott writes me, January 14, 1856, that the person referred to was neither Mr. Duncan, nor any other Western man.—T. B. S.

much larger vote than is now imagined. The Whig party at the North and in Ohio is much more imbued with the anti-slavery feeling than the Locofoco party, and of course, in all the States, except New York, he will make upon the former, the larger inroads. I should not be surprised if many of the Old Hunkers in New York unite with the Barnburners and the dissatisfied Whigs to give the vote of that State to Mr. Van Buren, and thereby indirectly promote the interest of General Cass. But I cease with speculations, and remain ever, Truly your friend.

LETTER XVII.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE.*—MR. CLAY AND THE WHIGS OF OHIO—GENERAL SCOTT AND THE VICE PRESIDENCY.

CINCINNATI, August 24, 1848.

In his address to the public, under date, April 10, 1848, in which was signified his consent that his name might be considered by the Whig National Convention, in the selection of a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Clay stated the controlling reasons which determined him, contrary to his previous inclinations, to yield that consent. Among the influences which led to his decision, the sentiments and wishes of Ohio had much force. His statement of the position of this great Whig State, standing in appropriate connection with the avowal of individual inclinations and views of duty which he entertained on the subject of assuming again the attitude of a candidate, is embodied in the extract following:

"With a strong disinclination to the use of my name again in connection with that office, I left my residence in December last, under a determination to announce to the public, in some suitable form, my desire not to be thought of as a candidate. During my absence, I frequently expressed to different gentlemen my unwillingness to be again in that attitude; but no one was authorized to publish my decision one way or the other, having reserved the right to do so exclusively to myself. On reflection, I thought it was due to my friends to consult with them before I took a final and decisive step. Accordingly, in the course of the last three months, I had many opportunities of conferring fully and freely with them. Many of them have addressed to me the strongest appeals, and the most earnest entreaties, both verbal and written, to dissuade me from executing my intended purpose. They have represented to me that the withdrawal of my name would be fatal to the success, and, perhaps, lead to the dissolution, of the party with which I have been associated, especially in the free States; that at no former period did there ever exist so great a probability of my election, if I would consent to the use of my name; that the

* This letter was published in the *Tribune* and is here copied from that print. —T. B. S.

great States of New York and Ohio would, in all human probability, cast their votes for me; that New York would more certainly bestow her suffrage upon me than upon any other candidate; and that Ohio would give her vote to no candidate, residing in the slave States, but to me."

The course of the Ohio delegation in the Convention, of which but one member cast a vote for Mr. Clay, not only not sustaining, but, apparently, refuting this representation of the position of Ohio; and Mr. Clay having been severely criticised by some persons for making it; I deem it but an act of justice to that noble minded statesman and patriot, in order to vindicate his truth and protect him from the imputation of having too highly colored his prospects in view of thereby securing the nomination, to show that his representation was not unwarranted. Indeed, it was corroborated by every evidence known to the public.

If the delicacy of his sentiments, on a question in regard to which feelings of disappointed ambition might be ascribed to him, constrains him to preserve a dignified silence, that fact only strengthens his claim to this act of friendship and justice. If "he would rather be right than be President," so, not for the Presidency would he do wrong. Much less, then, should he be deemed capable of constructing an argument, on baseless grounds, to favor the chances of procuring a nomination for that office. Should any, looking to the promise from Ohio, set forth in the Address, and failing to see the fulfillment in the votes of her delegation, be inclined to assert that *his* eagerness unduly inflamed his hopes and expressions, the sarcastic spirit of the remark must be confessed; but its point should be aimed at others, if at any, rather than Mr. Clay.

It may be well supposed that Mr. Clay, though uttering neither complaints nor reproaches, indulges keen regrets at having been led into error as to the sentiments of Ohio, and, consequently, into a false position himself; *for, most certainly, had he anticipated such a vote as her delegation actually cast with respect to himself, he would not, assuredly, have permitted the use of his name before the Convention.*

It is due, then, in his justification to aver, that numerous representations made to him by gentlemen entitled to his entire respect, *more* than warranted all he said of Ohio. Of the contents of some of the letters addressed to him from various quarters of the State—from the Lake, from the center, and from the borders—by eminent gentlemen, holding the highest social and official positions, some of them standing in peculiarly commanding relations to the State organization of the Whig party, and all of them not merely of presumed, but of undoubtedly accurate knowledge of the sentiments of the State, *I speak by the card;* for they were voluntarily inclosed to me for transmission to him, though I had never sought to procure any such letters to be written, nor to enjoy the pleasure of reading them, nor to execute the office, however agreeable in itself, of commending them, in obedience to the desire of the writers, to his serious consideration. Having thus been made an instrument, in some sort, of influencing

his course, I feel the more strongly impelled, and the more conclusively justified, in presenting this *voluntary* testimony to shield *him* from the evil consequences resulting, if any result, from his error, if, indeed, he indulged any error, as to the sentiments and predilections of Ohio, respecting a Presidential candidate.

The letters forwarded through me, soon after Mr. Clay's return from the East, when an apprehension prevailed extensively that he would not allow his name to be presented to the Convention, urged earnest remonstrances on behalf of a vast majority of the Whigs of Ohio, against the withdrawal of his name, and as earnest appeals to submit it to the Convention. They represented that General Taylor could never receive the *Whig* vote of Ohio; that large masses—the Quakers, people of the Western Reserve, the Miami tribes—never would vote to support war, slavery extension, and non-commitalism; that Judge McLean, having no strong hold on the Whig heart of Ohio, neither old Whigs nor young would willingly take him; that though Mr. Corwin was preferred in Ohio, his friends thought that this was not the proper time to press that preference; that a large number of the counties had declared for Clay, and scarcely one for either Taylor, Scott, or McLean; that the friends of Clay and Corwin were *identical* almost universally in Ohio; that the Corwin men said, "Give us Corwin or Clay," and the Clay men said, "Give us Clay or Corwin;" that they believed Ohio could be carried again for Clay, that there was scarcely a doubt of it, and that it *certainly* could, if he should declare for the Ordinance of '87; that, should Taylor be nominated, the Whigs of the North would be compelled, in self-defense, to nominate a Northern man or suffer dissolution; that some would vote for Hale, some for Taylor, and some for any Wilmot-Proviso Democrat who should chance to run; that it would be a vain effort to attempt to give the Whig vote of the State to Taylor; that a much larger number of reliable Whigs preferred Clay than favored the claims of any other person spoken of; that, as a first choice in Ohio, sentiment was rapidly concentrating on Clay, and most certainly it was already almost universally directed to him as a second choice; that at that time, McLean, Taylor, Corwin, and Clay were the only persons seriously thought of for the Presidency in Ohio; that neither McLean nor Taylor would get any support from Ohio until all hope of the success of Corwin and Clay was abandoned; that, should either Taylor or McLean be forced on the party, defeat in Ohio would be certain; that they would feel as if all were afloat on a tempestuous, or, at least, uncertain sea, if Clay's name were withdrawn; that it was hoped *no contingency* would arise in which he would withhold it, etc., etc., etc.

Such were some of the considerations addressed to Mr. Clay, by gentlemen of the highest respectability in Ohio. It is admitted that such representations, from such sources, which, he did not doubt, were "honestly made and sincerely believed," were entitled to his credence and consideration, and that what he said in regard to Ohio in his Address, was fully war-

ranted. Let none, then, blame *him* for what he said—let none repeat an expression of regret that he said what he did. Let us rather regret that gentlemen from Ohio led him into error, or if their representations were well founded, their truth was not verified in the expected action of others. But it is not my design to arraign the conduct of any; but simply to present facts, of which the coloring is softened rather than heightened.

Another portion of the history of the late Whig National Convention, recently brought to my knowledge, will perhaps surprise others, especially in Ohio, as much as it did me, wherein, according to my humble conviction, it appears that by neglect of duty, disregard of instructions, or some other cause, justice was not done to the Whig party, if indeed a gross wrong was not designedly perpetrated against Mr. Clay and General Scott.

I am in possession of the most satisfactory evidence that General Scott was willing to run for the Vice Presidency on a ticket with Mr. Clay; but that fact was not disclosed to the members of the Philadelphia Convention, by the member of Congress who was AUTHORIZED *to make it known!*

"Clay and Scott," was a ticket ardently desired by a great many Whigs —perhaps a vast majority of them—in Ohio; but the apprehension seemed to be universal that General Scott would, under no circumstances, run for the secondary office.

Constantly engaged in active and earnest exertions, as you know, to promote the election of the Philadelphia nominees, which I most sincerely and ardently desire for the good of the country, I have addressed you this communication in not the slightest spirit of opposition to *them.* They were parties to none of the transactions here adverted to. Impelled solely by the conviction that justice to Mr. Clay and duty to the public require this exposition, it is respectfully submitted through the *Tribune.*

[The two letters following, corroborating the foregoing, one from Governor Bebb, and the other from Samuel Forrer, of the same general tenor of others addressed to Mr. Clay, make an appropriate appendix to the communication to the New York *Tribune.*]

LETTER XVIII.

WILLIAM BEBB TO MR. CLAY.*

HAMILTON, Ohio, April 4, 1848.

DEAR SIR—Sentiments of delicacy which you can better appreciate than I express, have detained me until now from adding my humble but earnest

* The history of this letter is as follows: A day or two before its date I received a message from Governor Bebb to meet him at night at his lodgings, at a hotel in Cincinnati. When I waited on him, he said he had come down to the city to consult me

remonstrance to that of a vast majority of our political friends against your withdrawal from the Presidential canvass.

To enumerate the facts and reasons upon which I would base this remonstrance, to one familiar as you are with the whole subject, and actuated by the motives which have directed your life and must determine your decision, would be equally officious and unnecessary. But there are some facts and considerations, perhaps more apparent to one residing north of the Ohio river, and who has several times canvassed either a large portion or the whole of the State, than to any one south of that river, however ample his means of knowledge, or extended his vision.

1. General Taylor, unless I have entirely misunderstood the Whigs and people of Ohio, never can get her *Whig* vote. Large masses of our people, Quakers, the Western Reserve, the Miami Tribes, never will vote to support war, slavery extension, and non-committalism. For one of the Whig family let me say that, having cast my first vote for Clay, in 1824, almost alone, in a dark corner of old Butler, in the face of the storm of Jacksonism, I can, at forty-five, vote aganst another military chieftain, more non-committal, and possessing fewer civil pretensions than even Andrew Jackson.

2. Judge McLean is a capable man, of high moral character, and possessing administrative qualities of no common order. But he has no strong hold on the Whig heart of Ohio. Neither the old friends of Clay, nor the young friends of Corwin, are at all likely willingly to take him. The former will remember not to forget old scores, and the latter new ones.

on the propriety of communicating the views contained in the letter, and in what form, preferring himself to go to Ashland, and desiring me to furnish him a letter to Mr. Clay to be used either in the event of his going in person or writing. I had never any intercourse with him before, and had no knowledge of his character, which I, however, supposed to be honorable. He certainly wore a showy, plausible, and zealous appearance; and, concurring in his avowed object, believing his facts, and not doubting his sincerity, I advised him to *write* to Mr. Clay, and gave him the desired letter, commending him and his views to Mr. Clay's favorable consideration. Mr. Clay's response, private and public, corresponded to the professed wishes of Governor Bebb's letter. After Mr. Clay's consent was given to the use of his name before the National Convention, but prior to its assemblage, I was astonished by information that Bebb was actively engaged in an intrigue to supplant Mr. Clay by bringing forward General Scott. A few days after the nomination of the Philadelphia Convention was proclaimed, passing up Third-street in Cincinnati. I found this man, equally flippant and fluent, discoursing to a number of gentlemen on the steps of a Bank, signalizing his zeal for General Taylor, and his displeasure at the factiousness of the "sore-headed *Clay*-Whigs" who were dissatisfied at Taylor's nomination. I was well-known to be one of those who owned, if not "sore heads," bruised hearts; and nettled by the insult, and feeling contempt for the man, I retorted by a reference to the evidence of his treachery contained in his letter to Mr. Clay. He made a feeble attempt to parry; and defied the publication of his letter. I determined to publish it when I thought proper; and here it is, perhaps the best example in history of a treacherous document aiding in the support of an honest reputation like that of Mr. Clay.—T. B. S.

Besides, the judge is not what Algebraists term a positive quantity. Few hate, nobody loves him.

3. Ohio prefers Corwin to all living men, yet a large number of her counties have declared for you, and scarcely one for either Taylor, Scott, or McLean. The Corwin men say, Give us Corwin, or give us Clay—the Clay men say, Give us Clay or give us Corwin.

4. What is true of Ohio as it regards General Taylor, is true of New York and much of New England.

5. Can you not get all the States you got before and New York besides? I can not answer for the others, but I believe *we can give you Ohio again—certainly* if you declare for our favorite ordinance of '87.

6. Should General Taylor be nominated it seems to me the Whigs of the North will be compelled, in self-defense, to nominate a Northern man, or suffer utter dissolution. Some would vote for Hale, some for Taylor, and some for any Wilmot Proviso Democrat that should happen to run. Much better would it be for the Whigs of Ohio to throw their votes away, than to eat their words, abandon their principles, advocate all they have heretofore opposed, and oppose all they have heretofore advocated, and thus lose their moral power and their self-respect, in a vain effort to give the Whig vote of the State to General Taylor. Should even enough of Locofocos fall into our ranks to give us a momentary victory, they would abandon us whenever a civilian or avowed Whig should be our candidate. I infinitely prefer our position as a conservative minority, to such shuffling and sacrifice of *true men* for accidental allies.

Pardon this plain blunt letter. I have long felt a desire to say to you the substance of what it contains, resisted by a strong aversion to appear obtrusive. This feeling, or rather dilemma, I communicated to our friend, Mr. Stevenson, who determined me to write, and who kindly handed me the inclosed letter.

Hoping your mind may be directed to wise conclusions, as I am sure it will be by the most patriotic motives, permit me to subscribe myself, with the highest esteem and regard,

Your friend and obedient servant.

LETTER XIX.

SAMUEL FORRER TO MR. CLAY.

COLUMBUS, April 7, 1848.

DEAR SIR—Many, very many, of your old and sincere friends have recently become much alarmed by the frequent intimations, from sources seemingly entitled to consideration, that it is your intention not to permit your name to be presented to the Whig National Convention for nomination to the office of President of the United States. Yet we can not doubt that you will give to the subject the full latitude of your mature judgment and

grave consideration, before you decide against the wishes, as I believe, of a larger, much larger, number of reliable Whigs than can be found to favor the claims of any one of the gentlemen yet named for that important office. It seems to me, indeed, that even as a first choice, public sentiment is rapidly concentrating to one point, and most certainly it is already almost universally directed to the same point as a second choice; at least, such *I know* to be the case in Ohio. The position which you at present occupy, in reference to the Presidential question, is the *inevitable* result of the early affections and long-established confidence of the universal Whig party; and the only question of importance which at all divides us here, and, as I suppose, elsewhere, is that of availability. I will not presume to offer to *you* an opinion in regard to the question of availability in its entire range. You alone can look over the whole ground; but as you must of necessity judge from a great number of individual opinions, and local, isolated facts, you will, I trust, though I am little known to you, indulge me with the expression of my convictions as to the state of feeling in Ohio:

First, then, Judge McLean, General Taylor, Mr. Corwin, and yourself are the only persons seriously thought of here for nomination. Neither of the two first will receive any support in the National Convention until all hope of success for Mr. Corwin or yourself is entirely abandoned. It is true, our delegates are not yet all appointed, but I think I can not be mistaken in this opinion.* Again, if either of these gentlemen is forced upon us, I consider defeat as certain. Judge McLean can not possibly get the full Whig vote of Ohio. In the Miami district, where I am best acquainted, the nomination of the Judge would cause an apathy among not only the old reliable Whigs, but also among the young working Whigs, to an extent which would alone prove fatal, no matter how full the vote in other portions of the State. The nomination would create no enthusiasm in any portion of the State; and without an enthusiastic and general movement in favor of our candidate, we can not possibly succeed here. General Taylor would receive but little support in the Western Reserve, and however much we esteem him as a man, or admire him as a soldier, our people can not, even out of the "Reserve," be brought to his support. There would doubtless be some enthusiasm enlisted in his behalf, in certain localities (in the Sciota valley, for one), and some who are not Whigs might be induced to support him; but the defections among the Whigs of the "Reserve" alone would be so great that no extraneous acquisition can possibly compensate for the loss.

Your friends and the friends of Mr. Corwin here are identical *almost* universally. The exceptions are in the "Reserve," where there is perhaps less doubt as to Mr. Corwin's views in regard to the introduction of slavery in newly acquired territory, where some might vote for him who would not vote for you. The number, however, would be small. There are also some

* When the delegates were all appointed, the prevailing complexion of the delegation, as a whole, strongly and decisively corroborated Mr. Forrer's views.—T. B. S.

good Whigs, and most devoted friends of yours, in some of the counties east of the Sciota River, who have not yet forgiven Mr. Corwin for *permitting* the General Assembly of Ohio to prefer him to a seat in the Senate of the United States. There is, however, scarcely a doubt that either yourself or Mr. Corwin could obtain the vote of Ohio; and although Mr. Corwin would undoubtedly be the choice of the Whigs of this State against all others, for reasons which you can readily appreciate and excuse, yet, as we can hardly hope that this is the proper time to press our individual preference, we look to you for our standard-bearer in the next campaign; and really, sir, we should feel as if all were afloat on a most tempestuous, or, at least, uncertain sea, if your name were no longer among those from whom the National Convention may select a candidate. Let us then hope that we may once more have the pleasure of rallying around our old and tried standard-bearer, and that no contingency may arise to prevent your remaining passive at least, and that you will permit your friends to present your name to the National Convention.

I need not say that it would give me great pleasure to hear from you, but I can not have the heart to tax you with any additional correspondence to that which must already be an intolerable burden to you.

I still reside at Dayton where I last had the pleasure of seeing you.

Yours truly.

LETTER XX.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO MR. CLAY.

FRANKFORT, August 29, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—The worst apprehensions in regard to my daughter, expressed in my last, have been realized. She is gone whither it is the greatest purpose of my life to accomplish a preparation to rejoin her. Though I cherish a spirit of submission and resignation to the will of the Great Disposer of events and am consoled with the assured belief that, all the sin and sorrow and pains of this life being escaped, she is now enjoying a blissful immortality; yet, of all the afflictions I have experienced—and many of them have been recently concentrated in bitter draughts—this is the bitterest cup of all. She was so beautiful, so intellectual, so purely amiable, and, withal, so romantically tender in her love of me, that I feel as if a part of my existence has gone out from me, and that I can never more, even when long years shall have fled forever, think of her without a pang. Though I should not obtrude my grief upon others, you, who are a father and have lost beloved children, will appreciate and excuse this unpremeditated mention of it.

Having an opportunity of conveyance in view, I return the letters of Governor Bebb and Mr. Forrer, importuning you to stand for the nomination for the Presidency before the Whig National Convention. I have

taken copies of them; but do not feel at liberty, in any case, to make any public use of Forrer's without consent. I am warranted by his own defiant consent, should occasion arise demanding it in my judgment, to publish that of Bebb. He may be unwise enough to provoke this; and it is highly probable some of the brainless original friends of General Taylor may create an inexorable necessity for it. In the latter case, as my truth may be called in question, in reference to my averments in the letter to the *Tribune*, I shall desire, in view of fortifying myself, to be furnished copies also of the letters of Judge Lazelle and Orrin Follett to you on the same subject, which I hope you will not fail to furnish me, though of course I will use neither of them publicly without the consent of their authors.

I should have transmitted you a manuscript copy of the letter to the *Tribune*, when it was forwarded, but had not time to transcribe it, and was unwilling to put the information of my authorship of it in possession of any copyist for the present. I will avow it, however, on any statement in it being contested by any responsible person. I read the draught to Charles Anderson of Cincinnati and Mr. Harlan of this place, both whom were much pleased with it. The former thinks it will produce an uproar in Ohio against her delegates to the Philadelphia Convention, and the latter is apprehensive that the Taylorites will be offended. Both conjectures will doubtless be verified, if the prudence of the parties does not get the better of their passions.

In the last week or two, the prospects of a reaction in Ohio, without which General Taylor stands no chance of obtaining her electoral vote, seem to be improving. The former political course of Mr. Van Buren, one of almost abject subservience to what, in the political cant of the day is termed "the slave power," who once gloried in the title of "the Northern man with Southern principles," renders him extremely assailable and vulnerable, and *his* nomination by the Buffalo Convention has sensibly checked the inroads which the Free Soil party seemed likely to make upon the Whig party. The defection in our ranks is nevertheless quite formidable, however the zealots may attempt to delude others or themselves.

Corwin has taken the stump. He was at Wilmington last Saturday and will be at Xenia on Wednesday next. These are seats of great defection, embracing many besides that good people, the Quakers, who reside in both neighborhoods. Corwin and the people of these and other places, were exceedingly desirous of inducing me to join him in his tour, if I may judge from the number of pressing letters addressed me in that behalf, and their advertisements of me in newspapers and handbills on faith. I would not have omitted the slightest of the last attentions and duties I owed my poor lost child, to have been the victor of Buena Vista. I certainly do prefer Taylor to Cass or Van Buren, and commend him to others in preference to either; but it is not a little curious that so many of those who charged me with ruining the Whig party because I preferred a statesman to a warrior for President, now prefer me to advocate the pretensions of

the warrior to themselves. This arises not merely from the desire to commit whom they call "Clay men" to the support of Taylor; but from the fact that the people will scarcely give ear to the original Taylorites, though willing to hear what can be honestly said in favor of Taylor's election. I think it will not be long before "printed principles" and capable statesmen, whom so many deemed unavailable, will get into fashion. I wrote to Corwin, that if it were not rather a theme for commiseration than merriment, I should laugh to see the great moral hero of the times, author of *the* great anti-war speech, sweating on the stump, grinding, pounding, and compounding materials more inflammable than gunpowder, to be let off in lieu of the "spontaneous combustion" fizzle—for so far it *is* a fizzle in Ohio, and in the slang phrase "it is n't any thing else." But if after all, availability prove unavailable, and we get beaten, there will be one consolation even in that, which will be *some* compensation for so woeful a disaster, namely, that it will forever (or at least ought to) put a stop to the upstartism of mere military men claiming the highest offices.

But I always fret myself upon this theme, and fearing I bore you with it, must cease. As ever, truly yours.

LETTER XXI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, September 4, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favors of the 10th and 29th ultimo, dated at Frankfort, and should have written to you before, but for the hope excited by the last, that I might possibly see you here prior to your return to Cincinnati, which, I regret, has not been realized. Should you at any time come this way, I request that you will oblige me by coming directly to my house, and making it your own during your sojourn.

I tender you cordial condolence on your late great bereavement. My own heart has so often bled from similar afflictions, that I can easily comprehend the poignancy of your grief, and heartily sympathize with you. Time alone, my dear sir, and your dependence on Him who, having given her to you, has seen fit to take her away, can mitigate your sorrows.

I perused with much interest and attention the copy which you sent me of the letter which you had kindly addressed to the *Tribune*. It is all that I wished it to be, and I most heartily thank you for it. I do not doubt that Mr. Greeley will cheerfully publish it. I feel much solicitude that my motives and conduct, in consenting that my name should be considered by the Philadelphia Convention, should be rightly understood and justified before the public. This friendly act of yours accomplishes all I desire in respect to Ohio. I shall regret very much, however, if it should involve you in any controversy with any of the parties concerned. I doubt, however, if it will have that effect; for, from what I hear from Ohio, the course

of its delegates to the Convention seems to be severely censured, and I imagine that they will be quite willing that it should not form a topic of prominent and prolonged discussion in the newspapers.* I am very sorry that I can not lay my hands upon the letters of Messrs. Lazelle and Follett. I am afraid that I have destroyed them, which, in consequence of the great number of the letters I receive, is the mode by which I dispose of them. Should circumstances hereafter make it necessary, you may refer to the names of the Hon. John Sloane of Wooster, (one of the best and truest men I have ever known in Ohio), and Mr. Van Tromp, of Lancaster, as gentlemen who strongly urged me to allow my name to go before the Convention. I am sure that neither of them will take any exception to such a reference.

I am daily assailed, and have received many, many letters from all quarters making inquiries of me as to my purposes in respect to the support of General Taylor, most of them urging me to come out with a public declaration in his favor, but some expressing a contrary wish. I have answered none of them, with two or three exceptions, to which I have returned confidential replies. I adhere to my purpose of silence and reserve. It is quite probable, as you inferred, that I may be constrained to vote for him, as I can vote for nobody else now before the public. But if I do, I shall do it quietly. I wish to lead or mislead no one. Should he be elected, and disappoint the Whigs, I desire to be spared any reproaches for having induced any of them to vote for him. Besides, I could not, in justice to myself, come out in any speech or letter, in his support, without assigning such reasons for my course as would operate, perhaps, as much against him as for him.

I have received two strange letters from Ohio, one from Cincinnati, and the other from Georgetown, inviting me to become an independent candidate. They were signed by several persons who were unknown to me. I scarcely need say that I positively, but respectfully, declined the invitation. I think it probable that one or both of my answers will be published. One of them (the letters to me) spoke in terms of strong condemnation of the Ohio delegates.

I think Mr. Corwin has put himself in a position of some embarrassment. After all that he has said against the Mexican war, etc., and in favor of Free Soil, he will find it, I should think, difficult to reconcile all his friends to the support of one whose attitude must necessarily render him hostile to the proposed restriction on New Mexico and California, and whose official influence will be directed *silently*, if not actively against it.† Hav-

* Mr Clay's conjecture was verified. The facts stated in the letter were too palpably known to the people of Ohio to be disputed or encountered by any of the delegates, and they pursued the best policy for them—the policy of silence.—T. B. S.

† Mr. Clay's reasoning here would be deemed logical in regard to General Taylor, but that he ignores the Allison letter, by which the General was virtually pledged not to veto any constitutional act of Congress; and his reasoning as to Mr. Corwin

ing made that question of Free Soil the paramount question of the day, can he hereafter justify himself to those who concur with him in refusing to support one who is pledged to the principle? Can he resume the leadership of that party? Will not somebody else displace him?

On the result of the existing contest I can form no satisfactory opinion. The elections of this month will throw some additional light upon it. Those of the last were far from being auspicious to General Taylor. A few more such letters as those addressed by him to Charleston, and to Mr. Lippard, will give him the *coup de grace.*

I remain, always, truly, your friend.

LETTER XXII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, September 12, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I wish briefly to acknowledge and heartily to thank you for your favor of the 9th inst.

I think it probable that the absence of Mr. Greeley from home accounts for the non-appearance of your letter to him, for which I have eagerly looked to the *Tribune.* I can not doubt his fidelity in all his movements up to and including the period of the Philadelphia Convention, Mr. L'Hommedieu to the contrary notwithstanding.

I have some curious letters about the course of our friend ———, which I must show you when you give me the pleasure of a visit.

Nominations, and threats of nominations, of me continue to come to me. I have one answer for them all, that I can not possibly accept.

A Maryland Whig elector writes me that that State is in imminent danger of falling into the hands of the Locofocos.

I shall be most happy to converse with you, as you propose, when you are here, on any public affairs.

Your friend.

would be conclusive also, but that he was not possessed of the fact, known to Mr. Corwin, that General Taylor, very soon after his return from Mexico, in New Orleans assured a gentleman, late of Missouri, formerly of New England, a friend of Truman Smith, late U. S. Senator from Connecticut, that having examined the question, he considered the Wilmot Proviso, both as a question of power and policy, settled affirmatively by the uniform precedents of the government in all its departments, from its origin. A copy of the letter of this gentleman to Mr. Smith, reporting his interview with General Taylor, was attested by Mr. Smith, who endorsed the standing of the writer; and this letter was held to be evidence equivalent to a specific pledge that General Taylor would not veto the Wilmot Proviso. A copy of such a letter so attested, or its substance, was probably furnished or made known to most of the prominent Whig speakers of the North. One was brought under my eyes by two such prominent orators, procured direct from Mr. Smith.—T. B. S.

LETTER XXIII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, October 9, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 2d. I saw, with pleasure, that the *Tribune* had at last published your letter, the delay having probably arisen from Mr. Greeley's absence. It was republished in the *Observer and Reporter*, and I am very glad that it is upon the record. The public mind is now so engrossed with the Presidential election, that it does not attract so much attention as it would have done at any other time; but it will tell with the thinking part of the community.

I think it hardly worth while to send you by the mail the letters to which I referred respecting our friend ———. I will reserve them for some cozy evening which I hope you will ere long pass with me.

As to General Taylor's last letter to Mr. Allison, I don't think much of it. He began with the silly, if not presumptuous, hope that the two parties would vie with each other in supporting him. Hence he courted both, and was to be an umpire between them. To the Whigs he said, "I am a Whig, and would have voted for Clay." To the Democrats, "I am not an ultra-Whig, and will make no pledges." As the prospect of getting Democratic votes has declined, he has become more Whig; and if the canvass were postponed a few months longer, he would be an ultra-Whig.

He gave to the Louisiana delegation no authority to withdraw his name, if not nominated at Philadelphia; but, *after* he was nominated, it was quite convenient and very prudent to ratify their act. But suppose another had been nominated, would there have been any ratification? I pause for a reply.

I can form no satisfactory opinion as to the issue of the contest. If General Taylor loses Ohio, I think he will lose the election. I believe Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware, and Connecticut all doubtful. He will now, I think, get New York. As to Ohio, do not be too confident of Mr. Corwin's fine speeches; they tell better from the stump than at the polls. When were we more certain than in 1842? Besides, it is impossible but that his moral position has been weakened.

I have succeeded, and I rejoice, in preventing my name from disturbing the canvass. They want me to go further, but I won't.

What do you think? I had a pressing letter from Governor Bebb to attend the Hamilton Convention, as the *first* of Mr. Corwin's friends addressed! I am, faithfully, your friend.

LETTER XXIV.

THOMAS B. STEVENSON TO MR. CLAY.

CINCINNATI, October 25, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—On this sheet you have a copy of Mr. L'Hommedieu's *intended* address to his constituents, but which was suppressed in the *Ga-*

zette office. In transcribing it, I inserted reference letters in brackets, intending to append some notes; but I forego doing so at present, believing you will not require any aid to an understanding of the entire document, which falls very far short, in my judgment, of achieving the successful defense of the writer for his course as explained by himself.

In haste, but as ever, truly yours.

[The following is a copy of an address, written by S. S. L'Hommedieu, Whig delegate from the first Congressional District of Ohio (Cincinnati), to the Whig National Convention, which assembled in Philadelphia, June 7, 1848. The address was inclosed under cover to "Wm. D. Gallagher, *Gazette* office, Cincinnati, Ohio," and was duly received by him, he being at the time associate editor (with Judge Wright, senior editor). I have understood from Mr. L'Hommedieu that Mr. Gallagher, under advice of others, did not think proper to publish it, as desired by the writer. I have seen this address, for the first time, this day, though Mr. L'Hommedieu had in conversation stated its contents to me a few weeks ago. I was elected Alternate Delegate, to serve in case of Mr. L'Hommedieu's failure in any case.*

Passing by all the other cumulative grounds of defense, some of them simply absurb, and none of them conclusive, I will notice here but one on which Mr. L'Hommedieu rests his justification. He says, "No instructions were given me by the Convention from whom I received the appointment of delegate," etc. This defense is merely technical, and is a palpable evasion of the substantial point itself suggests. It is true, that no instructions in the form of resolutions were given by the District Convention, simply because, considering the circumstances under which the appointment was granted and accepted, such instructions were deemed superfluous, and, moreover, would have implied a distrust of the fidelity of the appointee, whose antecedents were well known, and whose preference for Mr. Clay, and anxiety to be chosen the delegate distinctively as a "Clay man," over the candidates in the interest of all the other Presidential aspirants, were equally notorious. The extraordinary circumstances attending his election, such, perhaps, as seldom or never attended a similar transaction, were peculiarly significant, and more emphatically expressive of the will of his constituents than could have been conveyed in an ordinary resolution of instructions, which usually signifies a mere preference of an individual. Before the Convention would proceed to ballot for a delegate, the candidates were severally required to present themselves and define their position and preferences with respect to a nominee for the Presidency.

Mr. L'Hommedieu presented himself as the friend of Mr. Clay. The qualification with which he says in his address he announced his prefer-

* Here ended the note prefixed to the copy of Mr. L'Hommedieu's address transmitted to Mr. Clay. The succeeding paragraph is now (1856) added.—T. B. S.

ence, was regarded as merely a piece of electioneering diplomacy, intended to soften opposition to himself in the Convention. It certainly could not be held to bind the Convention, nor permitted to be reserved as a justification for disobeying the will of constituents, which he perfectly understood from many unequivocal evidences besides his appointment as delegate, but which he ignored at Philadelphia. Judge Spencer, a gentleman of commanding ability and universal popularity, avowed his preference for Mr. Corwin. Hon. N. G. Pendleton addressed the Convention, and was accepted and voted for by the friends of General Taylor. General Wade declared for General Scott. After the preceding candidates had addressed the Convention, its proceedings were delayed, in order to send for the venerable Judge Burnet. He had long been confined to his house by a crippled limb, but was at length brought in with his crutches, when he addressed the Convention as a candidate for delegate, believed to be in the interest of Judge McLean. All the candidates being heard, each one having signified his individual preference of a candidate for the Presidency, and the preference of each differing from all the rest, the balloting was then proceeded with, and resulted in the choice of Mr. L'Hommedieu, beating the whole field of opponents for an appointment which, had the other candidates, like himself, preferred Mr. Clay, would probably have been bestowed on either of his competitors, rather than on him. And the election of the alternate delegate was not less, if not more significant and conclusive of the will of the Whigs of the District in favor of Mr Clay. Owing to the number of scattering votes, a choice was not effected on the first ballot. On the second ballot, the contest lay between Judge Hart and myself. Judge Hart was deservedly popular, personally, in the city and County. I was comparatively little known personally, and had only that morning returned to the city from a visit to Kentucky, totally ignorant, till I entered the Convention, that any one had ever thought of me as a representative, primary or secondary, of the Whigs in the District in the National Convention. But the preference of the Editor of the *Atlas* for Mr. Clay was too well known to be doubted or questioned; and I was the only candidate voted for who was not required to avow, in person or by proxy, his preference; for such a requisition upon me was smiled at as supurfluous. I was elected. And, had Providence permitted my attendance at the Philadelphia Convention, I should have insisted on the will of the District being represented by the vote of the delegate, and endeavored to frustrate (perhaps unavailingly, but still resolutely) the intrigue by which the choice of Ohio was unquestionably nullified. I have set down these things here, because, although they may now be deemed needless references, they possess a certain historic value. Ohio was irrecoverably lost to the Whigs; and the cause of her political downfall is clearly traceable to the disobedience of her delegation in the Philadelphia Convention of 1848 to the popular will.—T. B. S.]

LETTER XXV.

S. S. L'HOMMEDIEU TO THE WHIGS OF THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO.

Your delegate to the Whig National Convention deems it his duty to make report to the Whigs who honored him with the appointment, and to notice some of the various influences made to bear in producing a result not altogether satisfactory to many true and tried Whigs of Ohio.

It is well known to you all, that when honored with the appointment of delegate, my first choice was Henry Clay, though I had many misgivings as to his availability. Between the day of our Convention and that of my departure for Philadelphia, not less than five hundred Clay Whigs of Cincinnati spoke to me despondingly of Mr. Clay's prospects, and cautioned me not to let my feelings run away with my judgment. On the boat, between Cincinnati and Pittsburg, I met with a number of delegates from Indiana, who had been chosen on account of their friendship to Mr. Clay. They all agreed in representing that in the several districts which they came from, there was a general despondency in relation to Mr. Clay's prospects before the people. At Pittsburg I remained a day, and had opportunity of meeting with a number of prominent Whigs of western Pennsylvania, who unanimously concurred in opinion that Mr. Clay's election was out of the question, and that again to make him our standard-bearer, would be sure to shipwreck the party. At Baltimore I stopped nearly a week, without meeting with a Whig who thought Mr. Clay stood any chance. In mingling freely with the Barnburners and Old Hunkers of the Democratic Convention, I heard the sentiment often expressed that there was but one movement could be made to unite the discordant elements of the Locofoco party—and that was the nomination of Mr. Clay by the Whig Convention.

At Washington City I found every thing doing that could be done, by members of Congress from the whole South, and by not a few from the North, to produce the belief on the minds of delegates, that no other man but General Taylor would answer for the nominee, and that, with every other candidate, our defeat was certain to follow.

It became clear to my mind, that to bring before the Convention, as a candidate, any one of the distinguished civilians whose names stood out prominently, with an expectation of success, was hopeless. Such being the state of the case, there seemed to be no course left for those who were not satisfied to have General Taylor the candidate, but to push forward General Scott. During my stay in Washington, I met not a single man, in or out of Congress, that spoke favorably to the nomination of Mr. Clay.

At Philadelphia I remained a day or two, and there found the almost unanimous feeling to be in favor of the availability of General Taylor. About ten days before the Convention, I went to New York, and there the

general sentiment was adverse to Mr. Clay's nomination. In a conversation with one of Mr. Clay's most strenuous supporters in New York—a gentleman connected with, and at the head of, the principal Clay Whig paper—he gave it as his decided opinion, that Mr. Clay would not get the nomination. He thought it advisable, however, for Mr. Clay's friends to adhere to him in Convention, and, by that course, allow the nomination to fall on General Taylor. This gentleman was the first one, from Cincinnati to New York, that I found willing that Mr. Clay should be adhered to. His counsel, I thought, lacked wisdom, if he did not lack sincerity.

From New York I returned to Washington, with the hope that I might, in some degree, be instrumental in counteracting the influences there brought to bear on Western delegates as they passed on their way to Philadelphia. I was fortunate enough to meet with most of those from Ohio and Indiana, to whom I imparted the results of my observations and inquiries at different points. Here, likewise, I met with several of Mr. Clay's ardent and *sincere* friends from Kentucky, to whom I expressed my strong conviction of mind, that Mr. Clay could not and would not receive the nomination, and suggested the propriety of withdrawing his name from the canvass.

Thus matters stood, until we met in Convention. It was soon apparent that, if the race was confined to Mr. Clay and General Taylor, the latter would receive the nomination by a large vote, and that the only slight hope was for Ohio to adhere to General Scott, and by so doing, form a nucleus. On the morning of the 7th instant, before the hour had arrived for the assembling of the Convention, the Ohio delegates, twenty-three in number, met at a room in Fourth-street, and after a full and free interchange of views, twenty-one united in the opinion that General Scott was the choice of Ohio, under the circumstances, and they resolved to adhere to him. During the progress of the Convention, several meetings were held by the friends of Mr. Clay and of the free State candidates, for the purpose of concentrating their votes. Strong appeals were made to Ohio to cast her united vote for Mr. Clay, in the forlorn hope that it would give him the nomination. We had satisfied ourselves fully, that if we changed position and voted for Mr. Clay, enough votes would follow from Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin, to give General Taylor the nomination. Besides this, we were convinced that if an impression was made that Ohio was going for Clay, there were enough delegates in Convention from New England and New York who would have wheeled about and given the nomination to General Taylor. There were, in my opinion, at least twenty-five or thirty delegates in the Convention who were desirous Taylor should be the nominee, and, at the same time, did not venture, in any of the ballotings, to give him their votes. Rather than he should have failed, most of them, probably, would have cast their votes for him.

There were not a few "*outsiders*" from the West and North, anxious to see nominated a prominent civilian from the West, whose opinions on the

slavery question were known to be in accordance with their own. Finding there was no hope of such a nomination, they mostly pursued a course calculated to lead to the success of the Southern candidate. They wanted no man to occupy the middle ground, but preferred the other extreme, in the hope to produce division in the Whig ranks of the north, and thereby enable themselves to build up a prominent Northern party.

I have been thus particular for several reasons. Many of Mr. Clay's warm, though over-zealous friends, denounce Ohio for not coming to his rescue. They declare that Ohio deserted her favorite at a time when she could have made him the standard-bearer of the Whig party. This is wrong, and it is equally undeserved and uncalled for. Ohio could not, if she had thought it best, have given Mr. Clay the nomination. His own Kentucky sent to the Convention a majority of delegates opposed to his nomination; and on the last ballot, none of her delegates, save Mr. Harlan, cast a vote for him.

I have fallen under the censure of many of Mr. Clay's friends, and have been charged with deserting him and violating instructions. In this, injustice has been done me. From boyhood to the present moment I have been a sincere friend to that great and much-abused man. No instructions were given me by the Convention from whom I received the appointment of delegate. On the contrary, I distinctly stated to that Convention, much as I preferred Mr. Clay, I should not cast the vote of the district for him if defeat to the Whig cause should stare me in the face.

It is not to be disguised that there was much cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the Whigs of the North and West at the course of the Whigs of the South, in pushing upon them, at this time, the nomination of a Southern man. The garment is cut out by *Democratic* States of the South, and the *Whig* States of the North are required to make it up to a good fit. For one, I say let us fall to work and make the coat. But for the next thirty years, let the North follow the cutting branch. Better far have honest Old Zack for President than the dough-faced general, who would probably involve the country in an endless war for Canada, Cuba, and Yucatan. With the exception of two or three Ohio delegates, their "sober second thoughts" have brought them to the conclusion that it is best to go for Taylor and Fillmore.

Your obedient servant.

New York, June 13, 1848.

LETTER XXVI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

Ashland, October 29, 1848.

My Dear Sir—I duly received your favor of the 23d inst. I have some intention of passing the ensuing winter at the South, and if I go, it

will be between the middle and last of December. In the mean time, with the exception of about a week that I may be at Louisville (but when I can not now say) I shall be generally at home. I hope that you will make your proposed visit to me soon after the Presidential election.

* * * * * * * *

I read with attentive interest your reflections on the gloomy state of public affairs and the public mind, and I share in your apprehensions of the future. Knowing, however, the proneness of men of advanced age to look upon their own latter times unfavorably, and to draw disadvantageous comparisons between them and the earlier periods of their lives, I have not allowed myself to indulge in those gloomy feelings. But the condition of age is not applicable to you. It is undeniable that the last twenty years of our public career have been marked by violence, fraud, corruption, and shameful disregard of principle. In studying the history of our British ancestors we find similar periods; and yet that nation ultimately purified itself, at least to a considerable extent, and got right again. I entertain hopes that our country may also recover, although I hardly indulge any expectation of living to witness its convalescence.

I have also received your favor of the 26th, transmitting Mr. L'Hommedieu's vindication. I agree with you that it is most lame and impotent. That a man knowing as well as he did the wishes of the community which he represented, should allow himself to be diverted from his duty by conversations in steam-boats, stages, and taverns, proves, at least, that he had not any very strong sense of the obligations under which he was placed. I suspect that he had a predisposition to defeat my nomination. At all events, he appears very promptly to have come into the support of the nomination, unacceptable as he knew it to be to the people of Ohio. He appears also to have been a ready and willing listener to the Taylor arguments. Who but himself believes, really, that there would have been any union between the Barnburners and Old Hunkers, if I had been nominated? And who can believe that *five hundred* of *my* friends in Cincinnati, before he left it, cautioned him against voting for me? What did he expect to do with that nucleus for Scott of which he speaks? But I forbear.

I regret extremely that your great State is now suffering from the wayward course of its delegation, and I wish that years may not elapse before it again attains the lofty eminence on which it lately stood.

Well; the election is nigh at hand, and fact will soon supersede all speculation.

* * * * * * * *

I am inclined to think that Cass will be elected, contrary to my wishes.

I reserve for the occasion of your contemplated visit, to which I look forward with pleasure, many things which I have not leisure now to write.

Your friend.

LETTER XXVII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Private.*)

ASHLAND, December 19, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR—On the eve of my departure for New Orleans, I have time only briefly to acknowlege the receipt of, and cordially to thank you for your friendly letter, transmitting slips, etc. The article from the *Chronicle** was composed with proper caution and due consideration.

Greeley writes me from Washington that the Free Soil question will be *certainly* adjusted, at this session, on the basis of admitting the newly acquired territory as one or two States into the Union.

Should that event occur, it will exercise some influence on my disposition to return to the Senate, should the office be within my power. It will leave none but the old questions of Tariff, Internal improvements, etc., on which I have heretofore so often addressed both branches of Congress.

Wishing you health, happiness, and every blessing,

I am, ever faithfully, your friend.

LETTER XXVIII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, April 21, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—It has been a good while since I heard from you. The last letter I wrote to you was from New Orleans, transmitting a letter which I hoped might benefit you at Washington; but as I have seen no annunciation of your name for any appointment, I fear that any application in your behalf, if one were made, has been unsuccessful.† From the general character of the appointments which I have observed, I apprehend that they have been pretty much confined to the Taylor men, to the exclusion of the friends of other candidates. Such a course, if it be adopted, will be both unwise and unjust.

I observe that the newspapers are stating that I am to deliver an agri-

* An article in which his return to the Senate was urged. The *Chronicle* was then under my editorial direction, and the article was from my pen.—T. B. S.

† An eminent gentleman of Kentucky, desiring to benefit me, by procuring an appointment placing me in charge of a bureau at Washington, procured a number of recommendations before I was advised of the movement, of which Mr. Clay's was one. It was seconded by every Whig member of Congress from Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana, with two or three exceptions, as I was told, and by many other prominent citizens. A senator informed me that they never were even opened in the department in which they were filed; and I was afterward really glad that I was not indebted for even a *tender* of any appointment from that Administration, and have never ceased regretting that I permitted others to make an application to it.—T. B. S.

cultural address at Cincinnati during the present year. Such a statement is without any authority from me, and I am totally at a loss to know how it came to be made. Will you do me the favor to see the managers of the Society, and let them know, if they do not already, that I have made no such engagement, nor can I? I have neither time, taste, nor, perhaps, talents for compositions suited to such occasions.

I returned home in good health, which, I thank God, I continue to enjoy. But I have not regained entirely my lost flesh.

I remain, ever truly, your friend.

LETTER XXIX.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, April 26, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—Being about to go to Louisville, and to be absent from home a week, I hasten to make a brief acknowledgment of your favor of the 24th. There are topics in it about which I should like to write, or rather talk, a great deal, if I had an opportunity.

With respect to the expression of the feelings of the President in regard to me, described in your letter, do read the inclosed letter, received by me also this day (returning it by mail after perusing it) from Colonel B. H. Payne, just returned at its date from the city of Washington to New Orleans. I have known him long, and always regarded him as a man of truth. There is no alternative but that of there existing some mistake, or some insincerity on the part of high functionaries. Charity and hope induce me to trust that it is the former.

I shall not be a candidate for the Convention.* There are many reasons why I think I should not be; but it will be sufficient to say that the session of that body will run into the session of Congress, and expose me to a winter's journey to Washington.

I shall be most happy to meet you again, and here, if practicable.

Your friend.

LETTER XXX.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

(*Confidential.*)

ASHLAND, June 18, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your letter, and learn with regret that you have abandoned your trip to Kentucky.

The mission to Portugal has been tendered to my son James in a handsome manner, and very creditably to the President. James's situation, in

* The State Convention called to frame a new Constitution of government for Kentucky.—T. B. S.

a pecuniary point of view, is one of perfect independence, and he has no need of any office as a means of support; but he has determined to accept the appointment, which he could not well decline, being unoccupied at present, and there existing no impediment to his going abroad. I have received from General Taylor quite a friendly letter.

My views in taking a seat in the Senate, if I am spared, remain the same as when I saw you. I shall go there with a determination to support any Whig measures for which I have heretofore contended, and in a state of mind and feelings prepared to judge fairly and impartially of the measures of the Administration. I shall not place myself in any leading position, either to support or oppose it. But I shall rather seek to be a calm and quiet looker on, rarely speaking, and when I do, endeavoring to throw oil on the troubled waters.

Many of the appointments of the Administration have given much dissatisfaction in various localities; and if it be true, as asserted, that the President leaves selections for office to the respective Secretaries, it is contrary to usage, very exceptionable, and I think unconstitutional. At last, however, I think that the true character of the Administration will be fixed and judged of by its measures of public policy.

I agree with you in believing that more difficulty will be encountered in fixing the boundaries of Texas, than in deciding the question of the introduction of slavery into the new Territories.

Whatever may be the ultimate purposes of Colonel Benton, I wish him heartily success in his effort to sustain himself in Missouri, although I doubt whether he will do so. The question of slavery in the slave States is one around which many strong prejudices, supported by long habit and powerful interests, real or imaginary, cluster. I have been mortified, but not surprised, at the course Kentucky is likely to take about it. The truth is, that many of our leading men, who had been favorable to gradual emancipation, have suppressed, modified, or abandoned their opinions. The Governor* is quite dumb on the perilous subject.

My health continues good, for one who has been five or six months in the midst of cholera. That epidemic now prevails in Lexington, but with less violence than in 1833.

I remain truly your friend.

LETTER XXXI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, June 30, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your two favors of the 25th and 26th instant. I tender you sincere condolence on the death of Dr. Combs.† It was distressing that he could not reach your house before his demise.

* John J. Crittenden, then Governor of Kentucky.—T. B. S.

† My father-in-law, Dr. Ennis Combs, formerly of Montgomery County, Kentucky,

According to my recollection, Colonel Benton was pleased with, and approved all that was done to admit Missouri into the Union. And if he ever reproached me with my agency in the matter, I have forgotten it. His nomination, in certain places, for the Presidency in 1852, may tend to his maintaining himself at home, which, I apprehend, he will have great difficulty in doing. I do not think that, if I were in your place, I would say any thing at present to mar his present exertions. As for myself, I should be sorry if my name were in any way now, if ever, brought out in connection with the Presidency.

I should deplore the event of the Administration being thrown into the minority in the House of Representatives. It would be bad for them, bad for the Whig party, and bad for the country. And it would be a subject of nearly equal regret that parties should be so balanced as that a few members, strictly belonging to neither, could control the House. I am very apprehensive that Kentucky will make no addition to our Whig representation in the next House, if she can maintain the ground she held in the last. In four or five districts, where there ought to be no doubt, great uncertainty exists.

I thank you for the information communicated about Mr. Chase.* I formerly knew him in Washington very well, and met him in Frankfort lately.

With regard to political affairs in Ohio, I fear that it will be a long, long time before the Whigs will be secure in the ascendancy. They never can be without the Western Reserve; and the problem is, how is that to be reunited? All this difficulty would have been avoided, if General Taylor had not been nominated. What responsibility has not its delegation incurred by the strange course it pursued in the Philadelphia Convention! Among other consequences, one is, that it postpones indefinitely, if it has not blighted forever, any prospects of Mr. Corwin's future elevation.

I think it probable that your conjectures are correct in regard to the President's feelings toward me. I have been a little provoked by the advertisement of me in the *Republic*,† a paper, by-the-by, which I do not take. That, and other circumstances, demonstrate that some alarm has seized them at Washington. As for any calculation which is made upon my poor support, all that I have ever said, all that I have ever thought, was, that I should take my seat in the Senate prepared to support Whig measures, prepared to oppose Locofoco measures, and in a state of mind to judge fairly and impartially of any new measures. The mission to Portugal, which, in fact, only rectifies in one son, an injustice which was done by Taylor to another [Colonel Clay], will not weigh a feather with me.

The cholera still lingers with us, but it is mild and forbearing. I have as yet, I thank God, lost no one. I am truly your friend.

then of Missouri. He died on the Ohio River, on his way to visit his children in Cincinnati and Kentucky.—T. B. S.

* Salmon P. Chase, then lately chosen U. S. Senator by a coalition, for the distribution of offices, between the Abolitionists and Democrats of the Ohio Legislature.—T. B. S.

† The then Administration organ at Washington.—T. B. S.

LETTER XXXII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, July 21, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 17th, and I am in arrear in acknowledging your preceding favor. I thank you for them both. The indisposition of Mrs. Clay and myself was slight and short, and I believe had no connection with the epidemic, which has, happily, greatly abated.

The conduct of the Attorney-General, as reported by our friend, Charles Anderson, was reprehensible.* The solution of it is to be found in the extreme desire at Washington to advance the popularity and interests of the Administration. I should have no objection to the publication of all the correspondence which has passed between the Executive and myself, in regard to the appointment of my son to the mission to Portugal. It would be seen from it, that, while the President has written to me in a perfectly friendly manner, I have made no commitment of myself, nor descended to any unmanly or unbecoming solicitation.

The subject of Canada, I fear, will be forced upon the public consideration. I do not believe, now that all protection to its products is withdrawn by Great Britain, and her navigation laws are repealed, and the ports of the Provinces are freely opened to foreign Powers, that the colonial connection can long remain. These measures do substantially, if not in form, make Canada an independent power. With a government in the colonies, a Legislature and a Ministry, modeled after those in the parent country, it will, I think, soon be perceived that the appointment of the Governor and the veto reserved to the Crown, are inconvenient and impracticable forms.

The important question is, what is to become of Canada? I adhere to the opinion, that the happiness of both the United States and Canada, will be best promoted by the independence of the latter.† But I am willing for one now to open a free-trade with her, for the same reason that Great Britain desires such commercial intercourse with us, that is, that she is behind us in skill, capital, and the progress of manufactures. We should profit most by opening new fields for our commerce and manufactures, and our free trade with Canada would be an exception to the principle of protection, which I still think we ought to maintain as to Europe.

Such, briefly, are my views. What those of the people at large are, or will be, remains to be seen. I do not know on what data General Scott has arrived at the conclusion that a large majority of the people of the United States desire the annexation of Canada.

* Reverdy Johnson, Attorney-General of the United States, was reported to have uttered an indignity to Mr. Clay, in saying the appointment of his son would make him, as a senator, obedient to the Administration, or else prove himself ungrateful for a favor he had solicited.—T. B. S.

† In his anti-Texas letter dated at Raleigh, North Carolina, 1844, he advanced the same opinion.—T. B. S.

I have some thoughts of passing through Cincinnati about the middle of next week, on my way, by Sandusky and Buffalo, to a sea-bath; but if I do, I shall not stop in your city longer than one night. My intention, if I go, is to take the Ridge route; but I hope that you will keep my secret, and give no publicity to my contemplated movement. Your friend.

LETTER XXXIII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

WASHINGTON, December 21, 1849.

MY DEAR SIR—

* * * * * * *

My relations to the President and his Cabinet are civil and amicable, but with all of them not very confidential.

There is great and bitter complaint against the Administration, from all the Whigs, or nearly all. I do not know what is to come of it.

My health, my spirits, and my position, all are very good. Much deference and consideration are shown me by even political opponents. I shall, by a course of calmness, moderation and dignity, endeavor to preserve these kindly feelings.

At present, I have no plans or projects to offer. I shall seize, however, any exigency that may arise to do good, if I can. Excuse brevity.

Your friend.

LETTER XXXIV.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

WASHINGTON, January 26, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR—I thank you for your two last favors. Your political speculations are interesting, and will be attentively considered; but I regret that I have not time to interchange views with you.

I addressed, some days ago, as strong a letter of recommendation of you for the office of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (vacated by Mr. Penrose) to Mr. Meredith, as I could make, or as I ever wrote. Corwin in person took it to him, and, as he informed me, supported it. I am sorry that it did not succeed, but that another was appointed. We shall continue our exertions for you, and I wish I could add with better prospects of success. Candor obliges me, however, to advise that you should not indulge in any very sanguine expectations. Corwin told me that he had written to you, which was the cause of my not doing so before.

There is a bad state of things here on the slavery question. My hopes and fears alternate. *Possibly I may* attempt some adjustment of it.

Your friend.

LETTER XXXV.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

WASHINGTON, April 3, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 26th. I should write you oftener and longer; but really, company, correspondence, and my public duties engross all my time. I have been compelled, indeed, to decline answering the greater part of the letters I receive, or neglect my public duties.

I think, perhaps I ought rather to say that I strongly hope, that the slavery question is approaching an amicable adjustment. I believe a bill combining the admission of California, and the government of the Territories, without the Proviso, could now pass. But there is a diversity of opinion whether the subjects shall be separated and put in different bills, or be combined together. In the former case, there would be a strenuous minority opposing California, and more doubt about the passage of the Territorial bills without the Proviso.

I do not know what will be Mr. Corwin's final course. Although our friendly intimacy continues, he has not communicated it to me. He told me that he did not mean to speak on the subject.

I am glad to see that your paper* is conducted with spirit and ability.

You will have seen that Mr. Calhoun is dead. The event, although expected, has created much sensation.

The Administration is without power. There is not much confidential intercourse between the two ends of the Avenue. My own relations to the members of it are civil, but cold.

With constant regard.

LETTER XXXVI.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

WASHINGTON, April 25, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 14th inst. In respect to your desire to engage some of the letter-writers to write occasionally for your paper, I regret that my acquaintance with that class of persons is very limited. Mr. J. E. Harvey and Mr. Francis J. Grund stay at the same hotel that I do. The former you know as "Independent" of the North American, and I presume the latter, too, by reputation. He is admitted to be one of the best letter-writers; and he (Mr. Grund) has just now taken a wonderful liking to me. He offered to write to you for nothing,

* The Maysville *Eagle*, of which I had then become proprietor and editor. —T. B. S.

but I told him that would not do, and that you and he must adjust the terms, etc., etc. And there I leave it.

The rumors so rife of Cabinet changes a week or two ago have ceased, and at present there is no talk of any. It is said that the President told his Cabinet that he liked them very much, and that they told him that they liked him very much, and so they agreed that they would not dissolve that union. Most people believe, however, that ere long a change will be made. In the mean time there is very little concert and co-operation betweeen the Capitol and the White House.

Your friend.

LETTER XXXVII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, November 3, 1850.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 1st inst., and was glad to learn from it that Mr. Corwin had tendered to you the head of the Bureau, as he had assured me he would do.* As to your decision not to take it, I think you are wise, if you have reasonable prospects of an independent support where you now are. Office with its uncertain tenure, considered as a means of obtaining a livelihood, is, I have always thought, not very desirable.

* * * * * * * *

I am, faithfully, your friend.

LETTER XXXVIII.

MR. CLAY TO THOMAS B. STEVENSON.

ASHLAND, May 17, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR—I received your favor of the 15th. There is no significance whatever to the article which you refer in the *Reporter*. It was put there without my authority or knowledge, and I regretted when I saw it.

You ask what is to be done if South Carolina secedes. I answer unhesitatingly, that the constitution and laws of the United States must continue to be enforced there, with all the power of the Union, if necessary. Secession is treason; and if it were not—if it were a legitimate and rightful exercise of power—it would be a virtual dissolution of the Union. For if one State may secede, every State may secede; and how long, in such a state of things, could we be kept together? Suppose Kentucky

* This tender was an unsolicited kindness; but was made under impressions as to my situation and wishes which stimulated the unavailing exertions to procure me an appointment under the Administration of President Fillmore's immediate predecessor.—T. B. S.

were to secede? Could the rest of the Union tolerate a foreign power in their very bosom? There are those who think the Union must be preserved and kept together by an exclusive reliance upon love and reason. That is not my opinion. I have some confidence in this instrumentality; but depend upon it, that no human government can exist without the power of applying force, and the actual application of it in extreme cases. My belief is, that if it should be applied to South Carolina, in the event of her secession, she would be speedily reduced to obedience, and that the Union, instead of being weakened, would acquire additional strength.

Writing, as you perceive, by an amanuensis, I must be brief, and conclude with assurances of my constant regard.

INDEX.

A

PAGE

ADAMS, J. Q.—His Death 80
Compliment to Mr. Clay, in an Album 292

B

BAYLY, Hon. Thomas H. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay 425
BEBB, William. His Letter to Mr. Clay 476
BELL, Hon. John. His Compromise Resolutions 159
His Defense of President Taylor 170
BENTON, Hon. Thomas H. His proof of Abolition of Slavery in Mexico 159
His affair with Mr. Foote 160
On the Fugitive Slave Law 396
His skirmishes with Mr. Clay 358, 364, 374, 375, 377
BERKLEY, Rev. E. F., His Letter on the Religious Character of Mr. Clay 53
His Discourse at the Funeral of Mr. Clay 445
BOWIE, Hon. Richard J. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay 435
BOYD, Hon. Linn, Speaker, etc. 437
BROOKE, Hon. Walter. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay 253
BROOKS, Hon. James. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay 430
BRECKINRIDGE, Hon. J. C. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay 414
BUTLER, Rev. C. M., D. D. His Sermon at the Funeral of Mr. Clay 256

C

CLAY, Mr. His Reply to Judge Underwood 17
His Raleigh Letter 25
His Debts paid by friends 40
Testimonial by Gold and Silver Artisans 42
" by Ladies of Richmond 43
" by Ladies of Tennessee 44
His Plea for famishing Ireland 46
Letter of thanks from two Irishmen 49
His Baptism and First Communion 52
His visit to Cape May, 1847 55
His Speech on the Mexican War 60
The Response to the Speech 72
On African Colonization 74
In Supreme Court 79
His last adieu to Mr. Adams 81
At Philadelphia and New York 83
Mr. Elected to the Senate, 1848 100

C

PAGE
CLAY, on Father Mathew ... 102
On Washington's Farewell Address ... 108
On the Purchase of Mount Vernon ... 111
His Compromise Resolutions ... 114
Review of his great Speech of February 5th and 6th, 1850 ... 132 to 154
The Great Pacificator ... 152
His Definition of a Compromise ... 156
His answer to an invitation to celebrate the Anniversary of 1787 ... 157
Abused by Abolitionists ... 158
On President Taylor's opposition to the report of the Committee of Thirteen ... 168
His Eulogy on General Taylor ... 172
And Mr. Mason, of Virginia ... 173
On the effect of the Constitution on slavery in the Territories ... 175
On Abolition agitations ... 177
On Mr. Rhett's Speech at Charleston ... 179
Defeat of his Bill a Victory ... 181
His position toward the North and South ... 185
The man of Compromise ... 192
A conspiracy against him ... 196
On Nullification ... 197
Goes to Newport ... 200
Reason of his return to the Senate ... 203
The Declaration against Agitation ... 206
A practical and national man ... 207
His last effort for Internal Improvements ... 208
Rejects "Constructive Mileage" ... 215
Gold Medal presented to him ... 218
His declining Health ... 219
His reception of Kossuth ... 221
His Decline and Death ... 225 to 228
Eulogies in the Senate ... 229 to 255
His Funeral at the Capitol ... 255
Résumé of his Life ... 263 to 298
(APPENDIX) His great Speech on his Compromise Resolutions ... 302
His Letter on Emancipation ... 346
On Emancipation in a Speech ... 353
Fifty-eight Extracts from His Speeches on the Debate on the Compromise of 1850 ... 354 to 396
His Letter, in 1851, to citizens of New York, on the state of the Country ... 402
His Burial ... 449
A Letter on Dueling ... 451
His Correspondence with Thomas B. Stevenson, Esq. ... 457 to 500
CALHOUN, J. C., Mr. Clay on the Death of ... 453
CASS, General. His Resolution and Mr. Clay's Reply ... 103
His Eulogy on Mr. Clay ... 235
CHANDLER, Hon. Joseph R. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay ... 422
CASKIE, Hon. John S. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay ... 422
CLEMENS, Hon. Jeremiah. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay ... 242
CLINGMAN, Hon. Thomas L. His tribute to Mr. Clay ... 22
COOPER, Hon. James. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay ... 244

E

PAGE
Ewing, Hon. Presley. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 419

F

Faulkner, Hon. Charles James. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 432
Foote, Senator, proposes the Committee of Thirteen..... 160
His affair with Mr. Benton..... 160
Forrer, Samuel. His Letter to Mr. Clay..... 478

G

Gentry, Hon. M. P. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 434

H

Hale, Hon. John P. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 241
Harrison, William H. Elected President..... 39
Haven, Hon. Solomon G. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 429
Hunter, Hon. Robert M. T. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 238

J

Jackson, General Andrew. His Party..... 38
Jones, Hon. George W. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 252

L

L'Hommedieu, S. S. His Letter to Whigs of Ohio..... 488
Louisville Journal, Tribute to Mr. Clay..... 23

P

Parker, Hon. Samuel W. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 434
Pearce, Senator, defeated Mr. Clay's Bill..... 390, 392, 393

R

Robertson, Chief Justice, of Kentucky, accepts the body of Mr. Clay from the hands of the Senate Committee..... 441
Rusk, Senator, and other Senators object to the Compromise Resolutions..... 126

S

Seward, Hon. William H. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 247
Stevenson, Thomas B. His Correspondence with Mr. Clay..... 455 to 500

T

Taylor, General. His Letter to Mr. Clay, announcing the Death of Colonel Clay..... 50
Will not submit to Convention..... 90
Opposed to the Compromise Measures..... 166
Thirteen, Committee of, appointment and Report..... 161
Tyler, John, His Treason..... 39

U

PAGE
Underwood, Judge, His Address to Mr. Clay..... 16
His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 229
Resigns his charge of the Funeral Cortège..... 440

V

Van Arsdale, Rev. Dr. Letter from..... 129
Venable, Hon. Abraham W. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 427

W

Walsh, Hon. Thomas Yates. His Eulogy on Mr. Clay..... 435
Webster, Daniel, sanctions Mr. Clay's Compromise Resolutions..... 157
His notice of General Taylor's Death..... 172
Desires the "Wilmot" for Congress..... 174
Whig Party, Fall of..... 88

V. 870